DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 026 048

JC 680 512

By-Brawer, Florence B.

Personality Characteristics of College and University Faculty: Implications for the Community College.

American Association of Junior Colleges, Washington, D.C.; California Univ., Los Angeles. ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Coll. Information.

Pub Date 68

Note-104p.

Available from-American Association of Junior Colleges, 13[illegible]5 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 ($2.00)

EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$5.30

Descriptors-*Faculty, *Junior Colleges, *Personality, *Placement, Psychology, Self Concept, *Teachers

Viewing the community college as oriented toward teaching rather than research, the author reviewed material that could (1) assist in the selection and placement of junior college faculty and (2) help people involved in the junior college movement to better know what they, themselves, and the movement are about. The monograph consists of (1) a review of personality theory and assessment, (2) reports of teacher personality, (3) classifications of faculty members on the bases of psychological and sociological theories, (4) a typology of junior college teachers, (5) potentially useful research, (6) faculty selection, (7) teacher training, (8) innovative amenability, (9) faculty roles, and (10) teacher-student relationships. Twenty recommendations included: (1) college and community should jointly define institutional goals, (2) administrators and faculty should understand every person's uniqueness and know himself as well, (3) professors of higher education should emphasize problems of the community college, adopt an inquiring mind, and encourage doctoral candidates to evaluate both organization and self, (4) doctoral students preparing for junior college work or research on personality assessment, occupational roles, or higher education should utilize systematic designs where sets of identifiable conditions relating to learning are specified. The author concludes that, if the community college is to grow dynamically and with direction, it must know the people within it and our search must continue to help them. (RM)

ED026048

PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS OF COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY FACULTY:

Implications for The Community College

By Florence B. Brawer

JC 680 512

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information / American Association of Junior Colleges

MONOGRAPH SERIES

Salvage, Redirection, or Custody? Remedial Education in the Community Junior College. By John E. Roueche. 1968. $2.00.

Junior College Institutional Research: The State of the Art. By John E. Roueche and John R. Boggs. 1968. $2.00.

Personality Characteristics of College and University Faculty: Implications for the Community College. By Florence B. Brawer. 1968. $2.00.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS OF COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY FACULTY:

Implications for The Community College

By Florence B. Brawer

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information
American Association of Junior Colleges
Monograph Series

Graduate School of Education and the
University Library
University of California, Los Angeles

This monograph was prepared pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

Price: $2.00

American Association of Junior Colleges
1315 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
Printed in U.S.A.

FOREWORD

With the remarkably swift expansion of the community college in numbers of institutions and enrollments, many questions confront the public that supports them, administrators who manage them, faculty who teach in them, students who attend them. What are their functions, present and emerging, in our changing world? What is their place in the cradle-to-grave hierarchy of education in the United States?

In this third in the ERIC series of monographs, Florence Brawer addresses herself to the question of community college faculties. She examines and reports the essence of the broad spectrum of researches which attempt to define the personality characteristics of college teachers with special implications for community college faculties. How does a college student choose teaching as a career? How does he pick a subject specialty? How does he elect the level where he can be most satisfied and effective—kindergarten, elementary or high school, community college, university undergraduate or graduate school, or adult education? What personality characteristics in terms of types of intelligence, interests, talents, abilities, attitudes toward people, etc., indicate that he may be a success or a failure at teaching in a given field at the community college level? How is he trained for a community college job? In what sort of an institution, by what kinds of professors or professionals? In what skills? How do community college administrators select him, initiate him into his tasks, provide further in-service training, correct his errors, reward his successes?

To find answers to these and related questions or leads to further research for answers, Dr. Brawer has examined and reports on investigations by educators, psychologists, psychiatrists, sociologists, specialists in communication, anthropologists, and those in associated disciplines. Read in its entirety at one or several sittings, one is overwhelmed by the variety of attacks on the problem, the complexity of angles and methods, and the difficulties that still lie in the way of arriving at formulas for identifying teachers as alike or different from other professionals as doctors, lawyers, ministers and from other teachers of different subjects and at different levels of education. Nevertheless, despite the complexity, this monograph is a most useful document.

It attacks and destroys, directly or by implication, a number of myths. All teachers are not alike in personality and functioning. Teaching is not an art, a science, or a technology, but all three in various combinations. Teachers are not just born nor made—nature and nurture together make us what we become. Cognitive teaching and learning are not always superior to teaching and learning for emotional development and for growth in vocational and technical skills, for each enriches the others. Community college subjects are not precious in themselves but must be made pertinent to each student, whatever his abilities and interests and aptitudes. They also must be relevant to the student's stage of growth and to his time if learning is to take place. There is wide misconception of the meaning of teaching pertinent to students and relevant to times. This misinterpretation is that Greek history, classic literature, and ancient philosophy should not be taught to contemporary students. The truth of the matter is that if these and other traditional subjects are taught, they should be brought to bear on the interests of students and the problems of current times.

Throughout this comprehensive study of research, Dr. Brawer stresses again and again that community college teachers, in fact all teachers in any field at any level, can function well only if the institutions present goals, aims, objectives, and policies; if its plans for future development and change are clearly defined and communicated; and if his part in these are specified as much as may be in a fluid, dynamic society.

All community college teachers are not suited, either by personality or by training, to all of the many roles most of them are now required to play—stimulating teachers in the classroom, expert test-makers, accountants, secretaries, typists, file clerks, advisors, counselors, effective community and public relations operators—since each of these roles demands special aptitudes, abilities, interests, and skills. To be aware of these myths and their destructive effects is the responsibility of both the administrators and of the teacher himself. Insights from research in personality and functioning are all brought together in the author's excellent review of role theory, of the several roles teachers play, of how these are formed by development of "life style," by personal and internal expectations, modified pressures ranging from those of various intimate groups—family, fellow workers—and on out of local, state, national, and world. They make clear what a faculty member can best do to serve his students, his institution, and his community.

By drawing together research in personality assessment and the theories and practices in teacher training, Dr. Brawer makes clear that these differences account in large measure for *gaps* between generations, in communication, and in credibility. In the decade of the sixties, these differences have, by extension, led to widespread student protest, revolt, and rebellion—and these same factors are forcing teachers, administrators, boards, trustees, parents, and communities into critical, sometimes frantic reexamination of the organizations and processes of education, of the selection and training of teachers, of the applications of research to classroom management of methods, and of the ways of assessing student progress in growth development and change. She points up some promising experiments and reorganizations already under way, fashioned in the light of personality researches from the Pavlovian behaviorist studies to the refinements of the Rorschach and the Minnesota Multiphasic; the development of the Strong Vocational Interest Inventory, and other interest, attitude, aptitude, and ability measures; the analysis of individual traits and the concepts of Gestalt; the assessment of the "authoritarian personality" marked by conventionality and set prejudices, and what such a teacher does to students of different kinds.

Applications of researches here summarized and others yet to come to determine goals and policies; to communicate them to faculty, students, employers, and the public; to determine and plan innovative practices, are long overdue. Many ways of speeding the process are stated or implied in this monograph on faculty personality characteristics of community college teachers.

Malcolm S. MacLean

Professor Emeritus
Higher Education
University of California, Los Angeles

PREFACE

Two U.C.L.A. graduate students included the following statement in an article published recently in *Educational Forum:*

> If the teacher is blind to his own motives and behavior, that is, if he does not know himself, he is likely to maintain attitudes that preclude authentic relationships with his students.*

A similar feeling is expressed in the old maxim, "No one can give what he does not have." The message rings clear in both—one must know who and what he is if he is to be successful in teaching, a most humane profession.

In this, the third monograph in the Clearinghouse series, the author addresses herself to studies of college teachers' personalities. It is a timely topic—at least part of the current, widespread campus unrest must be ascribed to a breakdown in communication between student and instructor. A teacher may find no better way to nurture understanding than to begin with self-awareness. Although the monograph is addressed particularly to junior college educators, its focus has implications for people concerned with personality assessment in all fields, including other levels of education, industry, and government.

There is a significant omission in the monograph. Although studies of effectiveness and the so-called successful teacher may well fit into some of the categories treated, there is no section devoted specifically to the appraisal of teacher performance. Because investigation in that area is so extensive and important, it will be covered in a future monograph in this series. That publication will be concerned with several dimensions of measuring faculty. In addition, a model for assessing the effective teacher will be introduced.

Dr. Brawer is an assistant research educationist at U.C.L.A. Her prior work includes several research studies on relationships among personality dimensions of teachers and other groups.

The ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information, a United States Office of Education-sponsored endeavor, operates as a joint project of the U.C.L.A. Graduate School of Education and the University Library. Our thanks to those groups and to American Association of Junior Colleges for their continuing support of the Clearinghouse.

---

* Glass, John F. and Judith. "Improving Graduate Education." *Educational Forum* 32: 439-446; May 1968.

Arthur M. Cohen

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This monograph is the result of the interest and effort of several people, to whom I express my sincere appreciation. Special thanks are extended to those staff members of the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information at U.C.L.A. who were involved in various phases of the project—from transcribing tapes, to searching for "seldom-in-the-stacks" books, to typing the manuscript.

Malcolm S. MacLean's foreword provides a comprehensive overview of the text. His encouragement as professor and his warm friendship over the years have been among the greatest rewards of the education process. Margaret McClean, who will certainly find much of her own thinking in these pages, has been consistently supportive and helpful. Martin J. Cohen offered some valuable comments while carefully reading the manuscript. Arthur M. Cohen, as ERIC director and friend, has provided organization, interest, and perceptive criticism when most needed. And finally, my family—Sid, Anne, and Mike—deserve special thanks for allowing these pursuits to materialize.

Florence B. Brawer

University of California, Los Angeles
1968

CONTENTS

Page
Foreword I
Preface V
Acknowledgments VII
Introduction XI

Part I—Perspective

Chapter I. **Personality Assessment** 3
Chapter II. **Faculty Images** 9
Chapter III. **Faculty Types** 14

Part II—Applications

Chapter IV. **Selection** 25
Chapter V. **Teacher Training and Personality Assessment** 34
Chapter VI. **Innovation and the Individual** 40
Chapter VII. **Conceptions of Faculty Roles** 46
Chapter VIII. **Teacher-Student Interactions** 52

Part III—A Final Look

Chapter IX. **Review and Recommendations** 65
Bibliography 79

INTRODUCTION

Conceived in a climate of change, the community college was born into the American educational scene amidst ambivalence and confusion. For many years few bothered to ask the "why" of this new institution. It was here. In terms of sheer number, it was growing at an unprecedented speed—and its growth continues. In terms of general development, it was moving in a variety of ways unparalleled by any previous American educational enterprise. Other forms of education provided a certain direction for its structure but, because of the unique tasks it assumed, it had no set patterns upon which to build. Now, fifty years since its inception, this branch of education is still seeking independence and recognition. It is still attempting to attain its own identity—realizing suddenly, perhaps, that mere growth in size and number is hardly justification for existence (62:18:21)*, and gradually becoming aware that it must exist for a reason. Reasons need to be defined in order to be useful and thus, the frequently ambiguous approaches employed by the community college in trying to achieve a unique awareness of self must be based upon a firm foundation.

While this awareness of the need to know "who am I" is fairly recent, there have been some tentative attempts to define the junior college in terms of the multifarious functions it performs. It has been called an "open door" institution because it welcomes all high school graduates and individuals over eighteen who demonstrate a desire to enroll. It has been characterized as a melting pot for vast numbers of students—terminal, returning, transfer—who appear at its threshold and offer a period of their lives in exchange for information, teaching, opportunities to grow and develop. Whether the exchange is truly a reciprocal one is not known, but the effort is there and sometimes the satisfaction as well.

This searching adolescent that is the community college of today

---

* Bracketed numbers refer to bibliographical entries on 79-89.

—so seriously seeking definition and its idiosyncratic reality—is often described as a "teaching institution," as a place where faculty shuns research activities in favor of teaching roles. Without a firm tradition upon which to establish current practices, without defined purposes to stabilize the organization, and without careful searching into the meaning of teaching, this characterization of the school as a "teaching institution" is not sufficient to determine a true identity. Simply *calling* it a "teaching institution" is not enough.

Recently, some serious efforts have been developed to help junior colleges build identity on a teaching-learning model. Cohen (34; 35; 36) has suggested that, basic to the definition of teaching, is a need for an inventory of what learning takes place as a result of faculty activities. His "focus on learning" demands that teaching be viewed valuable only to the extent it contributes to predictable, demonstrable changes in students' abilities. He has advanced the concept of defined learning as a possible structure for an investigation into the nature of this college and as a goal to which it may strive.

Conversely, Sanford (135) has noted that the college curriculum may be a uniquely potent instrument for personality development and that a redefinition of the curriculum is in order if we are to assure its greatest impact. The need for curricular revision is seen as dependent upon at least four conditions: (1) better articulation of the central features of differing curriculum modes, presentations, and content; (2) continuing experimentation with curricular philosophy; (3) self-examination of teachers; and (4) recognition of the differing impacts of curriculums or different types of students and in different environments. He further points out that in order to develop college curriculums and to improve instruction, the kinds of research about American colleges which appear to be most needed are intensive, theoretically oriented, long-term studies.

> . . . studies of students and intensive, probably also long-term, studies of the inner workings of educational institutions which will require close involvement of the researcher with the processes of the college or university. Just as the typical Navajo family is now said to be comprised of a father, a mother, two children, and a Harvard anthropologist, so the time may come when the typical college will be made up of the faculty, the administration, the students, and the social researchers (135:1013).

Whatever the focus and wherever identity is to be found in any organization, people must be seen as the key. Examination of "functions" or "purposes" alone cannot present a complete picture. The people who are involved in junior college education represent the true nature of the institution. They must be appraised if the complex structure that is the American community college is to begin to find a unique form in which to conduct its unique activities.

The characteristics of individuals or groups of individuals within an organization may be understood from a number of points of view. The educational, sociological, and psychological literature abounds with numerous studies which draw word pictures of what is going on in higher education. Existing institutions are often described in terms of appearance, function, and people served. There have been innumerable attempts to picture physical installations, to describe exploding numbers of courses, and to appraise the various teaching and community-affiliated functions. Similarly, there have been many efforts to describe community college personnel, administrators, faculty, and students in terms of demographic data and, more recently, in terms of whether certain of these individuals have been able to demonstrate success according to specified criteria of effectiveness. A host of research paradigms have been employed and all sorts of ingenious methods have been used to eke out bits of information—often inconclusive—which might possibly answer the many questions revolving about higher education in general and the junior college in particular.

In spite of this search for definition of purpose, little is yet known about people in the junior college. The figures regarding size, enrollments, and numbers of college personnel are impressive, but normative data require more than numerical symbols for understanding. What does it really mean that 1,528,220 students are currently enrolled in 912 colleges? That the typical school serves a given proportion of youths in the country within a given spectrum of age (155)? That faculty members number approximately 74,068? That a certain per cent of the faculty hold master's and doctor's degrees (16)? What do these numbers imply for educators who plan the various curriculums to meet the needs of a changing population? For taxpayers who support the institutions and expect to see certain tangible proof of justification for their investments? What do these figures portend for future study? And what, indeed, do they mean in terms of student learning, community well-being, individual achievement, and personality development?

In the literature of the field, individuals who are involved with the schools—administrators, faculty, students—are rarely considered as singular personalities, but often only as mass groups in impersonal organizations. If society is to know itself, to "understand what it is about," it must be willing to look at people as people, as individuals functioning in a special kind of world but living in a much larger context. In this larger world, vast networks of communication, flexible standards, and varying demands impinge to such an extent that lines between occupation and outside activities are fluid and often indiscernible.

The study of people in any organization stems from a larger body of knowledge. The intricacies manifest in human nature have interested philosophers, writers, behavioral scientists, and curious laymen for untold numbers of years. Early scholars speculated on human structure; writers explored and sometimes flaunted the complexities of man's behavior. The difficulties which result from the frequent conflicts—often unconscious—between the emotional and intellectual life have provided sources of interest and/or anguish to individuals throughout the ages. These concerns about people and the way they feel, act, and think have been expressed in writing, in the theater, and in many forms of artistic output. Similarly, they have been represented in a vast body of literature which, through more or less "scientific" methods, has attempted to report a variety of investigations into the multidimensional facets of man.

Of the many ventures into human knowledge, a somewhat specialized type of interest has grown up about the area of personality assessment. A pervasive problem in this area, however, is the fact that the concept of personality has been variously described—that it means different things to different people. Rooted in the classic Latin word *persona,* the term stems from the view that personality is the outer presentation of an individual—a mask. As used in *dramatis persona,* the meaning of personality is of the role or functions within the group. It has been defined as

> the sum total of everything that constitutes a person's mental, emotional, and temperamental makeup (156:29).

The concept of growth is introduced into the definition when personality is seen as the mental organization of an individual at any developmental stage. The cognitive dimensions determining internal organization are stressed when the term is described as the

> dynamic organization within the individual of those psychophysical systems that determine his characteristic behavior and thought (6:28).

Messick saw personality structure as composed of certain stable and relatively enduring components of

> personality organization . . . invoked to account for recurrent similarities and consistencies in behavior over time and over situations (114:94).

Although there is generally some agreement regarding the constituents of personality as the resultants of instinctual and environmental interactions, disagreements may arise "over the dynamic forces that operate to produce the elements of personality" (86:543).

Despite the fact that definitions are not stabilized, this interest in the individual personality has stimulated a vast amount of research activities. A glance at the literature readily attests to the manifest interest in questions revolving about unique patterns of thinking, feeling, behaving. The search for knowledge of the individual in occupational and social situations is an ongoing process. Certainly we know more today about human behavior than we did at the turn of the century; some of this knowledge has already been implemented into schools, business organizations, and social action groups. The concern for the individual continues to cycle upward, and more and more people are asking for identity and for awareness of "what they are about." Still, much more needs to be known and much more must be integrated into our daily lives and into the institutions in which we labor if these demands are to be satisfied.

One way to increase our understanding of people is to study individuals who function in particular roles in specific occupational spheres. Psychologists, sociologists, and scientists have all been studied through more or less systematic investigations—the results of which have been reported with more or less objectivity. Teachers have also been the object of many studies that have been integrated into older educational systems; these investigations appear to be pertinent to issues of the identity and structure of the community college.

In this paper, one element in the educational organization has been singled out for study—the faculty. What does the literature tell us about teachers as people? In addition to the usual normative data so frequently compiled, what questions about personality characteristics of instructors at various levels of education might give us answers to facilitate further development of our institutions? Is there any general information about elementary and secondary people that we can add to our understanding of junior college personnel? Are there ways of classifying teachers according to specific typologies? And finally, will knowledge of people help us better to understand what is going on in the community college?

There have been many studies about teachers in general, but comparatively few in-depth reports have been made about people who specialize in teaching at the college or university level. This is partly due to the fact that postsecondary school personalities are frequently identified as sociologists, psychologists, historians, etc., rather than as "teachers." Their identification—either established individually by themselves or by their academic roles—has been primarily in terms of academic disciplines rather than as members of the teaching profession. Investigations reporting the general characteristics of college teachers are of interest, in spite of the fact that they have been primarily biographical in nature. Emden (47) listed some 5,000 students who attended Oxford University prior to 1500 A.D., while the lives of eminent Dutch scholars at the University of Leyden were recorded by Meursius in a volume published in 1613 (115). Biographical sketches of professors, lecturers, and librarians who served at the University of Keil between the seventeenth and twentieth centuries have been provided by Volbehr and Weyl (162). Hewett (85) summarized the lives of early faculty members and students at Cornell University and individual biographies have been written about many of the early college and university presidents: James Manning of Brown; Mark Hopkins of Williams; Henry P. Tappan and James

B. Angell of the University of Michigan; and Charles W. Eliot of Harvard.

Two main conclusions may be drawn from a search of the literature regarding studies of college and university faculty: the studies are few and they are inconclusive. Why, then, a review of this literature and a discussion of their implications? The answer is simply that in the absence of clearcut knowledge, we are floundering; that an attempt to bring together the relevant research may reveal trends which have not been previously apparent; and that if the community college is to grow dynamically and with direction, it must know the people within it.

The awareness of this knowledge and the conclusions which may be subsequently drawn from it are the fundamental objectives of this monograph. We need to get a picture of what the institution is like for baseline understanding and to compare it with other institutions. We also need to draw together the relevant literature in order to develop means for using what we know about people in a purposive way. Gustad suggested that it is

> occasionally helpful to . . . gain some perspective on the task. Since one of the really critical tasks confronting those in higher education today is the development of a better understanding of college teachers, we need all the perspective we can get. There is a very considerable body of folklore about college teachers and a small but growing body of research. The folklore is interesting and sometimes informative; the research is informative and sometimes interesting. What we really know however is a mere pittance compared with what we ought to know (71:112).

The rationale for this investigation is based upon a two-fold purpose: that personality assessment of teachers in the community college will help provide an image of what the institution is like and that personality assessment will help junior colleges arrange procedures for selection, recruitment, and assignment of faculty and administrators. Several premises underlie this report: (1) there has been no functional approach to previous reviews of research on community college teachers; (2) if the community or junior college is to have a deliberate effect, we need to know about its people as well as its buildings, its administration organization, and its finances; (3) although the junior college is large and growing fast, we do not yet know what effect it has upon its students or the community at large; (4) we should assess the institution from many viewpoints in order to gain a picture of the structure.

Despite the many difficulties in attempting to order the research regarding teachers, the findings have something to say to us. Even though most of the research on teachers in general—and especially teachers in the junior college—has not been put to practical use, there are many potentially useful applications of teacher assessment:

(1) selecting teachers for initial employment; (2) assigning teachers to differential roles; (3) helping teacher candidates select themselves; (4) selecting counselors and administrators; (5) assigning students to teachers on the basis of similarities or differences in cognitive style; (6) selecting teachers to be retrained or otherwise assigned to positions of leadership; (7) helping introduce innovations by choosing people most likely to accept them; (8) changing institutional structure and procedures; (9) counseling people into teaching; and (10) becoming increasingly aware of what is going on in the schools.

Considering the potential values of research on teacher characteristics, why have educational institutions so rarely employed their findings in organizational practices? Why is it that the junior college does not use the results of personality studies? Why don't they conduct their own studies on personality characteristics of teachers? Literature in the field of personality assessment has been written and put forth in such a way that it is of little value to the faculty and to the college teacher, administrator, or board member. Why? The theories from which it stems are probably sound; certainly they are still evolving. The people who study characteristics are well-trained thinkers and researchers. Potentially, one can see great value for an institution if the people within it know more themselves. Why should it be so difficult to apply designs and findings to education and to the junior college especially? Several reasons are apparent: the teacher in the community college has an ill-defined role, being at once academician, advisor, classroom manager, test-maker, etc. The effect of environmental press is not clear. The writing itself is often too esoteric. There is difficulty in relating narrowly based research to practice.

This monograph brings into focus the available literature regarding personality characteristics of teachers, especially as it relates to college and university personnel and to community college faculty. For this purpose, the concept of personality will be seen as

> the integrated experiences of the individual as a psychological unit and the manner by which all forces—conscious and unconscious—interpret his uniqueness in relation to his personal self and external society.

The paper may be of interest to those educators, psychologists, and other individuals who are involved in appraising social organizations. It is primarily directed to the research director of the community college and/or the president who assigns research for the school; the university professor of higher education who prepares junior college teachers; and the doctoral student who is involved with research on personality characteristics, teacher training, psychological theory, or other issues in higher education.

The text itself has been conceived in three parts. Part I draws a perspective of the field of personality assessment and develops the rationale upon which this monograph is structured. Part II describes some of the research in terms of its application to specified areas. Of the hundreds of publications dealing with individual appraisal, those with particular relevance for the community college are cited, grouped into specialized areas in terms of potential function or use, and reviewed in three ways: (1) presenting a general overview picture of faculty personnel to help determine baseline data in a manner similar to the establishment of information about finances, buildings, administrative facilities, etc.; (2) according to several typological structures which are based upon sociological and psychological classifications; and (3) according to the specific use to which the data may be put. This includes selection of faculty, teacher training, amenability toward innovative procedures, faculty roles, and student-teacher relationships. Part III deals with recommendations for further study of the personality dimensions of academicians in higher education. These are based upon the raw data and upon the implications which may be drawn from the material presented in the monograph.

PART I: PERSPECTIVE

PERSONALITY ASSESSMENT

chapter 1

A SURVEY

Man has studied man since the beginnings of time. Although formal approaches to appraisal are comparatively recent phenomena, individual assessment is probably as old as human interaction itself. The early conceptions of man advanced by the classical scholars—Hippocrates, Plato, and Aristotle—were concerned with the reflection of the macrocosmic order of nature and the microcosmic makeup of the individual. The "basic elements"—air, earth, fire, and water—were depicted in the form of four bodily "humors," the predominate humor representing a corresponding emphasis of some one temperament. This doctrine was further amplified by the Roman physician, Galen, who saw humors as the roots of all diseases and the bases of temperament, and thus anticipated the nosological schema of present day psychiatric theory.

These basic traits and the various nuances of individual personality, character, and temperament have concerned many others throughout history. Philosophers and writers such as Shakespeare, Dostoevsky, Goethe, and Kant were all fascinated with human behavior and with the intricacies of human emotions. The foundations for a more structured approach to personal evaluation, however, were laid by Galton's pioneering efforts in the psychology of individual differences, and by Cattell's measurements of the intelligence of school children. Stemming from the insightful work of these men, attempts were made to develop psychological theories built upon a variety of dimensions and to classify human beings according to particular typologies. Jung, Kretschmer and Sheldon classified traits into various types. Freud and Jung brought the unconscious into focus as they investigated the dynamics underlying human action, thought and feeling, while Adler, Fromm, Horney, Sullivan, and Lewin were all especially concerned with the interactions of people in social groups. Other theories of personality were soon developed. Allport stressed the psychology of the individual. Angyal, Goldstein, and Maslow posed organismic theories which had been germinated in the seed beds provided earlier by Aristotle, Spinoza, and William James, and which extended the principles expounded by Wertheimer, Koffka, and Kohler. Spearman, Cattell, and Guilford sought to isolate the most characteristic features of human functioning; Hull, Dollard, and Miller soon developed learning theories based upon the stimulus-response concept. Murphy's biosocial theory, Murray's personology, and the self-theories of Rogers and Sarbin have all had an impact upon our understanding of human behavior. The ego psychologists—notably Erikson, Hartmann, Rapaport, and Kris—encompass the psychological structures that mediate the mechanisms of adaptation and defense. And still our search continues for more perceptive knowledge of the individual in his world today.

These many efforts to describe and understand human functioning have generated a vast body of research. Investigations have been conducted for purposes of describing populations, dividing groups of people into various typologies, and selecting and predicting effectiveness in specialized situations. Various attempts have also been made to form a bridge between individual personality and occupational choice and success.

Early theories were translated into practice when, as part of the wide-scale testing and selection programs in World War I, personality testing of military personnel was extensively employed. Few college students have escaped some kind of interest or personality inventory, while people in such fields as medicine, science, law, and education have been examined in attempts to equate personality with vocation.

The previous activities soon gave birth to vocational, educational, and personal counseling procedures, which were nurtured by the national needs for training and reemployment in the postwar years. The Great Depression, the intensified testing programs of World War II, and the vast activities of the Veterans Administration, working in collaboration with schools and colleges, swelled the demands for trained specialists; gave impetus to the instruction and preparation of qualified people in the techniques of guidance and counseling; and created general concerns for more knowledge of ourselves and others. The vast body of literature which deals with the individual personality, his selection into various occupational fields, and the prediction of his subsequent occupational success attests to this interest. Allport's statement in the early 1920's—that there were no other "psychologists, at least at Harvard, who seemed to be interested in social values as an academic problem, nor in developing a life-like psychology of personality" (8:385) no longer represents the situation today.

The systematic study of large numbers of military recruits conducted by the Office of Strategic Services (123) is of particular note since it represented the epitome of appraisal efforts. Charged with the responsibility for developing procedural systems which revealed individual patterns of personality so that reliable predictions of usefulness could be made, the O.S.S. staff found that one of its greatest handicaps was the difficulty in obtaining adequate job descriptions because of the nature of the war activities involved. This problem was compounded by another obstacle—the lack of criteria upon which those selected could be evaluated. Today, despite further efforts to understand people in precise vocational, academic, social, and military situations—despite the numerous and diverse methods for better seeing man in his quest for a creative and meaningful life, the problems which were demonstrated earlier through the O.S.S. program are still timely. Human understanding is dependent upon the interaction of individuals in a set occupational environment, and upon the stipulation of specific criteria before assessment schemes may be attempted.

Those problems which became apparent in the appraisal of armed forces personnel are also evident when individual effectiveness must be determined for purposes of selection, when students are considered for placement in schools, and when it is important to discover what types of people would be most effective in certain kinds of positions in particular environmental situations. Stern, Stein, and Bloom described the desire to

> . . . increase the probability that individuals being selected for participation in . . . various kinds of institutional programs would do so with maximum efficiency and economy, both for themselves and for the institution in question (147:23).

Murray (120) conceptualized a scheme to consider relationships between the press of the environment and the particular needs of the individual. Unlike much of the work in personality assessment that took place before this rationale was developed, he saw behavior as a result of the interaction between the individual—his potentialities and his personality needs—and other structural units—persons, things, events, and symbols existing in the environment. MacKinnon; Crutchfield; Barron and Block (103); Pace (124) (125); and Stern, Stein and Bloom (147) have all elaborated upon this theory, but the intricacies of the problem—the interdynamics existing among people and the interactions of individuals and external situations—are not considered in many other research activities. Much of the difficulty in fitting theoretical knowledge and research results into existing institutions appears to be that the many variables inherent in the occupational situation are not always considered with the many variables inherent in the individual. Accurate predictions would seem to be incumbent upon the consideration of the environmental press/individual-need concept; the specification of criteria; and the prescription of definite objectives.

The field of study which deals with individuals in terms of personality dynamics is no longer an introductory field where one meets difficulty in finding colleagues who are involved with similar problems. Certainly there are divergent thinkers here, as everywhere, but personality assessment has come into its own and is now a recognized area of study. There are other issues, however, that have kept the results of potentially meaningful investigations from being used. These problems vary with particular situations; but it is both interesting and discouraging to note that even in organizations where there is considerable awareness of the need for change, research activities do not often initiate the implementation of research findings. There have been some attempts, for example, to predict teacher performance. While many of these studies have failed to isolate consistent dimensions—Dixon and Morse (40); Heil (79); Leavitt (99); and Ryans (133)(134)—others have produced results significant for purposes of selection and prediction of effectiveness. These are often ignored at all levels of education, although there exists today an increased and fast-growing awareness of the individual. If we are truly to understand the teacher as a person, we cannot continue to ignore previous work or to overlook the challenge to extend that work.

THE TEACHER AND PERSONALITY RESEARCH

The community college is the fastest growing element in American higher education; yet, so far, it has achieved this growth by attending to the mechanics of development rather than by heeding theories of personality upon which the understanding of the student may be founded. Theory, of course, does not always require conscious recognition, and it can be too far removed from practicality to warrant incorporation into an organization until proper mechanics are developed to make it feasible. Sound theory, however—theory which has the capacity to deal successfully with the exigencies of man's life—can, and often does, stimulate hypotheses which, through careful and rigorous testing, may prove to be helpful in the betterment of society. The community college has recourse to a body of theory and to some good attempts to apply theoretical constructs in its organization. Why, then, is so much done in the institution without recognition of what might be done? Why are school personnel often selected without heed to what we know about human development and individual differences? What do we know about personality characteristics of people who teach in our many educational institutions? What do we *need* to know in order to bridge the gap between theoretical knowledge which resides in a vacuum of potential usefulness and the actual implementation of that knowledge into our system of higher education?

A considerable body of literature has been stimulated and developed upon the historical interest in human functioning. The awareness of personality differences and dynamic encounters between different individuals in different societies is evidenced by the library shelves filled with material dealing with people and their cognitive and emotional worlds. The philosophical conjectures of the early scholastics gave vent to more structured theories of personality and, subsequently, to a multitude of research activities. Just as certain results of these efforts have been implemented into actual organizations, many of the concepts developed by dynamically oriented personality theorists have been adopted into our everyday language. The classification of people as "extraverts" or "introverts"; as "inner-directed" or "outer-directed"; the awareness of individual differences existing in the elementary classroom, the business organization, and institutions of higher education; the gradual acceptance of the belief that behavior is, at least in part, dynamic and propelled by unconscious forces—all of these notions have become rather commonplace.

Other ideas and theoretical concepts, however, have not become a part of our everyday life and our social organizations. We may understand the dynamics of the authoritarian personality (4), for example, and yet choose to disregard the fact that an overwhelming number of people selected to teach may be predominantly motivated by desires to "show others how they should act." Similarly, there are many published results which are ignored and/or unread although they may suggest guidelines for better understanding of people in various situations—diagnostic, academic, and vocational. The many serious attempts to assess people for academic positions alone are often read and then discarded—sometimes as irrelevant, sometimes as impractical, and sometimes filed "for future use."

An overwhelming amount of research in the field of teacher effectiveness is reported with confusing results (41: 118). In 1955, it was suggested that despite a large number of investigations regarding the identification and prediction of teacher effectiveness, relatively little more was known then than was known in 1900 (66). Many studies have failed to produce significant results and many others, especially those which deal with personality variables, have resulted in such pedestrian findings as, for example, that pupils learn better from teachers who are kind, cheerful, and sympathetic to pupil problems. Perhaps the major limitations of earlier efforts to investigate teacher personalities are that they were conducted in a "theoretical vacuum" and that they relied upon a single criterion of teacher effectiveness (for example, "the ideal teacher"), rather than a global criterion or a number of variables.

Other reasons why research results have not consistently affected institutional practices are apparent. The objectives chosen for measurement by researchers are not always identical or congruent with objectives which are sought for pupils by teachers. Most of the research on characteristics of teachers has been concerned with those in elementary and secondary schools. The many studies which deal with teaching at the college level are difficult to analyze and this research is often not well done and is frequently scanty. Further, those studies that are technically best may deal with unimportant problems, while the important problems have not been attacked with a scientific approach. There is even less known about teachers in community colleges.

FACULTY IMAGES

chapter 2

Assessment cannot be considered a singular concept, nor can it be approached from only one direction. Just as there are many dimensions to a human being, so there are many ways of looking at him. In the preceding chapter a perspective was drawn of selected personality theories which seem relevant to teachers—particularly, junior college instructors. Another way of viewing the individual is in terms of the image he conveys in his occupational sphere; although perceptions, of course, are the function of the perceiver and thus, vary accordingly. Still, there are some general, nondemographic ways of seeing college teachers. This chapter will present a few of the many attempts to picture the faculty from a global point of view.

THE CHANGING ROLE

Approximately a quarter of a million Americans are engaged in college and university teaching today. While most are involved in several functions, the role of the teacher and the college and university professor may be described in terms of three general activities: the research, the informational, and the character-developing function. The changing roles of the college professor are developments in the vast and historically unique professional class that arose in American society with the growth of colleges and universities (96). In the latter-half of the 19th century, several innovations were found to be significant to this development: the rise of the natural sciences; the Morrill Act of 1862, whereby education became concerned with technology, science, and other practical affairs rather than with the classical and theological; and the emergence of the free elective system. Trends growing out of these innovations included a decline in the character-developing function of the college instructor; the rise of professional societies and professional identification on the part of those college teachers who emphasized their various specific disciplines; the rise of the doctrine of academic freedom; and the increased stress on research and publications—noted by Caplow and McGee in *The Academic Marketplace* (30) as the sole criterion for employment in many colleges and universities. The rise of the doctorate, the doctorate as a "union card," and the decline of the college professor's influence on the management of his institution's affairs then emerged from these trends. Impersonal bureaucratic structures within American higher educational institutions and a decline in teaching enthusiasm followed.

THE COLLEGE TEACHER

The college professor has been seen in various lights. His image has become simultaneously esteemed and respected as well as being the subject of jokes and casual remarks. A survey by Bowman (21) of periodicals in the United States from the turn of the century to 1938 searched those articles that alluded to the professional college teacher. It was found that the college professor was often described in terms of "unselfishness, humanness, practicality, love of knowledge, competency, social inadequacy, impracticality, and dispassion." Beardslee and O'Dowd (14), investigating students' occupational stereotypes, suggested that the college professor was rated highest of all professions insofar as intelligence, thoughtfulness, personal satisfaction, and wisdom were concerned.

There have also been various studies in which ratings were obtained on characteristics of the "ideal teacher." Clinton, for example, found that students attributed to the ideal college professor such qualities as interest in students, fairness, pleasing personality, keenness of intellect, and range of information (33). A similar approach to defining the image of the ideal professor was employed by Bousfield who discovered a shift in the order of attributes: fairness, master of subject, interestingness of delivery, organization of material, clear exposition, keenness of intellect, interest in students, and helpfulness (19). The ideal qualifications of faculty in liberal arts colleges were summarized by Trabue who asked several hundred college presidents to define the ideal characteristics of college instructors (158). Qualities of the good teacher were described as encouragement of individual thoughts, emotional stability, tolerance, and sympathy. These college presidents also preferred the kind of instructor who identified himself primarily as a college teacher rather than as a specialist in a subject area field. Several other investigations have been made concerning the attributes of teachers of known or acknowledged distinction. Kelly's (1929) early study of teachers was based upon the participation of 187 church-affiliated colleges (94). Teachers rated highest were characterized primarily by their interest in students, sympathy, helpfulness, and enthusiasm, while mastery of subject matter and industry were rated less desirable qualities. Social skills and organizational competency, then, were viewed ahead of intellectual distinction, and the emphasis on a "teaching" rather than a disciplinary orientation was noted.

In a discussion of the career decisions of college faculty members, Gustad (69) cited certain predominant characteristics and suggested that although exact lower boundaries on any intellectual scale are difficult to set, is it obvious that college professors would all score very high. This characteristic, however, does not differentiate people in academic life from members of other occupational groups where a high level of intelligence is mandatory; it is therefore a necessary but not a sufficient characteristic. Another predominant characteristic was that most of the academicians tended to come from middle class homes. This kind of background produces generally serious, "conscientious, (upward or at least aspiring) individuals who consider hard work and education as the key to success." (69:113) However, all individuals possessing a combination of intelligence and motivation to success do not become academicians. We must look elsewhere for the missing key—perhaps to be found in a preference for stimulating and socially isolated activities of an intellectual nature. Studies of activities records of academicians, both as children and as adults, might reveal certain characteristics that would give us material for describing and selecting members of the profession.

Thoroughness of knowledge in the subject taught, logical and forthright presentation, discussion stimulation, and familiarity with recent developments in the field have been isolated as distinct qualities of successful college teachers. In a study by Maslow and Zimmerman, faculty and students rated instructors at a large college on the basis of effectiveness as teachers, as personalities, and as creative individuals (105). High positive correlations were found between the ratings by students and by faculty: creativeness rated higher than "good personality" by both groups.

THE JUNIOR COLLEGE TEACHER

Junior college teachers in Wyoming responded to a questionnaire designed to identify certain attitudes toward their work (32). Generally, only backgrounds of the teachers were cited and no area was concerned with personality characteristics. On the other hand, a study by Hendrix related personality measures of community college teachers to the presence or absence of certain academic personnel policies and procedures—academic rank and title, policies and procedures for securing tenure, and formal evaluations (84). Another report by Hendrix found that the independent variables of rank, tenure, and evaluation were related to life-record data reported by faculty members in the colleges (83). It was concluded that institutional policies are operative in explaining the relationship between such variables as employment status, father's and mother's education, father's birthplace, varsity athletics, and debate participation. One of two factors would appear to be operating: either college policies affect the attraction and retention of instructors who exhibit certain characteristics or the "accumulation" of faculty members with certain characteristics results in the establishment of those policies.

The most encompassing recent study of community college faculty members was reported in 1967. Believing that there is still a range of unresolved issues developing around the role of faculty in the burgeoning junior college, Garrison visited members of various schools throughout the country. Each instructor was asked eighteen open-ended questions, such as: "Are you making junior college teaching a permanent thing?" "To what extent and in what way should faculty counsel students?" An effort was made to get beneath the surface in order to determine actual personality factors and to discover the types of respondents. Garrison noted that

> . . . the impression, (indeed, the conviction) deepened that the junior college teacher is—or may be becoming—a new breed of instructor in higher education. Markedly different in significant ways from the usual situation of his four-year colleagues are his conditions of instruction, his aims, and his professional and philosophical attitudes towards his task. Not simply a post-high school instructor of grades thirteen and fourteen, he is in his own desire, and view, a colleague in a new kind of collegiate effort, as yet ill-defined and in furious flux. He is unsure of his status in the educational spectrum, for he fits few traditional categories. He is aware that he is being asked to function professionally in an unprecedented situation, and he is deeply concerned about this professionalism, in the best sense of that term. He is the servant of several demanding masters, and he is groping to bring such demands into a compatibility, a coherence, that will command his loyalty and his long-range commitment (61:15).

Although the Garrison study represented a considerable effort expended over a wide territory, only a few pages were devoted to the characteristics of teachers in the junior college. These people were conceptualized as being student-centered rather than subject-centered, and as dealing with students who represent an extraordinary range of abilities and motivations. In general, the study was concerned with situations in which faculty work, the time they put forth, their professional requirements, their division and department head relationships, professional affiliations, and guidance; very little revolved about them as people.

SUMMARY

This chapter has reviewed rather cursorily some of the literature dealing with general characteristics of college teachers. Although there is much material reporting normative data, it has not been reviewed because it does not help clarify the image of the faculty member. Rather, a few nondemographic studies, quite general in nature, have been reported here. These present various images of college teachers and may add to our understanding of members of the teaching profession. Additionally, they may affect people who come into the college and may help draw a picture of this segment of higher education.

This material, then, may serve as baseline data for our general awareness of academic personalities. A potentially more useful approach to understanding, however, would be the organization of research material into specific categories in terms of the various functions which the research might serve. The following chapters will be devoted to such a task.

FACULTY TYPES

chapter 3

One way to understand people is to group them according to types based on systems of classification that define special traits and characteristics. This sort of procedure has sometimes caused as much difficulty as it has facilitated understanding of human behavior because static stereotypes may develop. On the other hand, systematic orders may be seen as ways of objectively viewing individuals and of focusing on understanding the many forces existing in human personalities, rather than as ways of pointing out weaknesses. Such approaches may enable us to bring an undifferentiated mass of material into working order, classifications thus becoming an alternative to confusion.

CLASSIFICATION SYSTEMS

Theoretical divisions of subjects into separate categories have been established by psychologists, sociologists, and anthropologists. The early scholastics saw in various people an emphasis of one trait or "humor" at the expense of others and accordingly developed systems for viewing individuals on the basis of the four humors. Kretschmer, Jung, Eysenck, and Sheldon all developed theoretical frameworks for specific orientations; thus, the attitudes of extraversion-introversion; the asthenic, athletic, and pyknic biological type; and the somatotypes—endomorphy, mesomorphy and extomorphy—became ways of looking at special types of people.

Horney saw individuals as moving toward, moving away from, and moving against others; while Riesman described social groups as being tradition-directed, inner-directed, and other-directed. Anthropologists and historians have labeled whole cultures in terms of aggression, subsistence patterns, and degrees of acculturation. Recently, Gusfield and Riesman (68) and Friedman (56) found teachers to represent special types, while a study by Cohen and Brawer (38) attempted to discover whether there were particular sorts of people who were chosen for faculty positions.

In their analysis of the faculty of two colleges, Gusfield and Riesman presented a classification system that may be simultaneously a source of speculation and a potential for exploration. Both schools were affiliated with universities in a large midwestern state. Both were developed under the auspices of the state universities, but made conscious efforts to depart from the higher education model of their parent institutions. They were explicitly dedicated to seeing whether average state university students—students who were, for the most part, first in their family to go to college and who would normally pursue rigidly narrow vocational aims at the large universities

> . . . could be stimulated by extraordinary measures and drawn

> away from narrowly vocational or "collegiate" definitions of the college-attending experience. They sought to develop for these students of average academic capacity and working-class origin, the kind of education which has been the prerogative of elite students from upper-middle class families and superior academic performance (68:274).

This particular typology contained three dimensions under which academic personnel were classified: (1) pioneer settlers, (2) pioneer adventurers, and (3) job holders. The pioneer settlers were seen as career-oriented planners in the image of the Caplow and McGee models, "like the pioneers of the old west who came to settle, seeking that fertile field that they could finally call their permanent home" (30:277). Embedded in firm professional orientations, these pioneer settlers were considered conservative, career-oriented "young fogies," in spite of the fact that they had elected to teach in experimental colleges. They were subclassified as either growth-stock professionals who viewed the new college as a potentially permanent abode or as "transient professionals" who saw their new college appointment as a "way station" toward a more settled position. In either case, the pioneer settlers considered their appointments as a chance to put their ideas into effect, "to decide what I would teach and to have a say in the department" (30:280). They emphasized efficiency, insisted on teaching materials closely related to research and writing, and—both transients and professionals—"tended to judge their colleges and themselves in terms of their ability to prepare undergraduate students for graduate schools" (30:282).

The pioneer adventurers expressed a dissonant attitude toward the more conventional professional career espoused by the settlers. They focused either on what they were getting away from in former schools or on what they were moving toward; but, in any case, the innovational character of the new college, rather than its career advantages, was an essential attraction. At the time they were studied, the adventurers appeared less committed than the settlers to the values and standards of professional disciplines. While they might be—and indeed, many were—competent scholars in their special subjects, they did not visualize their academic lives in the same direction as the settlers. Their roles appeared to be less a measure of dedicated attitude toward their fields than a kind of enactment toward an interdisciplinarian, more broadly defined, occupational orientation.

The job holders, the third type in this system, differed from both settlers and adventurers in that their academic work did not represent the central dimension of their lives, but rather, means to other ends. Motivated by neither the

> . . . academic marketplace nor the ideologies of missionary commitment to the experiment . . . (this academic) stands outside

> the diversities represented in the orientations of settlers and adventurers, getting his "kicks" perhaps in the enjoyment of family, in the context of leisure time or in some other occupation (30:278).

While this attempt to appraise faculty in terms of a specific typology presents a rather clearcut picture that emphasizes certain traits or features, most classificatory schemas are not so vivid, nor definitive. Gusfield and Reisman cautioned that most of the respondents participating in the studies represented a little of each type; this appears true of most classificatory systems. They might be simultaneously settlers, adventurers, or job holders. Further, the typologies are internal to the population studied and, in terms of the national sample, combinations may appear to be more intense, with adventurers and settlers perhaps appearing alike.

Adelson (2) developed a typology based on an anthropologically oriented scheme that isolated four distinct modes of healing: shamanism, magic, religion, and mysticism. The shaman heals with personal powers, using craft, charming, and cunning; the magician heals through knowledge of complex rules; the priest, as an agent of an omnipotent authority; and the mystic treats the source of illness. Following this system, three types of instructors were described: 1) the teacher as a shaman, 2) the teacher as a priest, and 3) the teacher as mystic healer.

Assuming the role of shaman, the teacher adopts the most narcissistic orientation. Unlike the true shaman, he may be humble and not necessarily exhibitionistic; however, he keeps the audience's (students') attention focused on his own demonstrations of charm and skill. In some cases this type of teacher has a strong impact on the student. More often, once away from his spell, the student finds his influence transient. The shaman-type teacher's focus on narcissism is autonomous and, although his orientation may invite our identification, he tempts his students into regressions. Therefore, whatever power he had at the time he taught is soon forgotten.

The teacher as priest claims his power through his office rather than through personal endowment. He is an agent of omnipotent authority, seeing himself in terms of continued identity with the agency, generally the graduate or professional school. The teacher-priest believes in a stratification of prestige and authority and in the hierarchical system that follows, emphasizing discipline, trials, and self-transformation. He is powerful and effective for many reasons. Teacher and students are generally in close relationship and the student, presented with an ambiguous idea of character and behavior, is encouraged to adopt this teacher as his model. His mode of teaching is effective because he offers his students a stake in a collective, Utopian purpose which is associated with power, position, money, and intellectual exclusiveness. Less obviously, but just as important,

> . . . the collectivity makes its appeal to the student in helping him to resolve internal confusions. This participation allows distinct identity choice; and supports that choice by collective approval; it reduces intellectual and moral ambiguity (2:410).

The third kind of teacher, the mystic healer, finds a source of illness in the patient's personality. He helps the patient (the student) realize both his flaws and his hidden strengths and, in this sense, he might be considered altruistic. Although this is the model of teacher that is closest to that found in college brochures,

> . . . it demands that the teacher set aside, for the moment at least, his own desires and his own concerns, to devote himself, without hidden ambivalence, to the needs of another. In short, the teacher's altruism must be genuine; and altruism is a fragile and unsteady trait, reactive, and all too frequently born out of its opposite. If the teacher's selflessness is false, expedient or mechanical, if it comes out of a failure in self-esteem, or if it gives away to an underlying envy (and these are real, ever-present possibilities) then the teaching at best will not come off, and at worst, may end in damaging the student (2:412).

Faculty members in the junior college also have been classified on the basis of a sociological orientation. Dealing with subject matterism versus disciplinarianism, Friedman (56; 57) described the teacher recruited from a high school position as a "high schooler." Generally, he had taught at the high school level five years or more, had earned a master's degree in a given academic field of specialization, and was over 35 years of age when the role switch was made from high school to junior college. As opposed to the teacher who might be more involved with method or with putting across a certain learning rationale, the high schooler emphasized subject matter. Consistent with this identification, he was described as deprecating "methods" courses in education and professors of education, even though he had at one time earned 20 hours or so in education courses to meet certification requirements and much of his conversation contained words that are typically educationese—"motivation, units, supervised study," and the like. Thus, in one sense the high schooler seems to negate something, while in another sense that "something" has already become a part of him, projected negatively. This dualism

> . . . sometimes promotes something of a rivalry between the subject matter's teacher and the professor of (junior college) education who often holds a position of leadership and power in junior college planning. For example, at one public junior college (which was undergoing a determined changeover from an academic only transfer college to an organization which was broader based), one teacher expressed a rather recurrent subject matterist anti-educational viewpoint (56:13).

Besides being devoted to subject matter, the high schooler generally belongs to two kinds of educational associations: teaching and academic-field societies.

The disciplinarian is different from the subject matterist in terms of his orientation and belief in a discipline rather than in a specific matter field. He usually holds a doctorate and has worked in the four-year college or university. While the prototype of the subject matterist is the high schooler in the public junior college, the university professor in the graduate school of arts or sciences is the prototype of the disciplinarian. And while the major work objective of the subject matterist is to "teach my subject matter to students," (56:15) the disciplinarian's major work objective is his research. The associational emphasis for the subject matterist is a teaching association or a teaching union; for the disciplinarian, it is an academic field association—e.g., the American Sociological Association, the American Psychological Association. The sense of colleagueship for the subject matterist is local in the employing organization; for the disciplinarian, it is a "cosmopolitan" or nationwide association.

Cohen and Brawer (38) conducted a study developed upon a different conceptual scheme. They attempted to relate problems of personality and its interactions with the requirements of a teacher's occupational role and to specify a typology predicated upon the Jungian (90) classification of psychological types. This system maintains that every individual possesses the mechanisms of both introversion and extraversion and that particular type is determined by the relative predominance of one attitude or the other. The bipolar distribution is further enhanced by the four functions—thinking, feeling, sensation, and intuition—where again, the preponderant function lends special character and further distinction to the basic attitude. The functions and attitudinal orientation both find their opposites expressed in the individual's unconscious.

Because Jungian typology depends on underlying processes as well as conscious posture, it may be assumed that its multidimensional structure would be particularly applicable to teaching, where manifold aspects of the personality are brought to the fore. If the various roles a teacher must play do, indeed, have a consistent underlying feature, it is then conceivable that teaching may be best handled by individuals of particular personality types. This typology may thus provide the rationale by which personality may be assessed and teaching success predicted.

The study examined the types of candidates for junior college faculty positions and their ratings by supervisors (deans of instruction or college presidents). It was hypothesized that: (1) subjects identified as intuitive-feeling types would be rated higher as teachers than would subjects identified as sensation-think types; and (2) that extraverted-feeling subjects would be more likely to be hired for first-time teaching positions than would introverted-thinking types. Fifty-six men and women who had been hired as junior college teaching interns or who had unsuccessfully applied for candidacy in the internship program were studied. Each candidate responded to the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (121), an objective technique developed upon Jung's conceptual scheme. From his responses, he was subsequently placed in the type-categories as directed by the Indicator's manual.

The results of this examination failed to support the hypotheses, although the correlations were in the predicted direction. It was found that subjects indicating preferences high in the feeling dimension were more likely to be employed in first-time teaching positions and that after several months as junior college instructors, they were given higher ratings by their supervisors than were those subjects who had demonstrated preferences for the thinking dimensions. This hypothesis was earlier presented as a statement in the Myers-Briggs manual when it was noted that intuitive-feeling people

> . . . may excel in teaching (particularly college and high school) [and] . . . their best chance of success and satisfaction lies in work which involves the unfolding of possibilities . . . for people (121:55).

Other findings suggested that no one type of person is employed as a first-time teacher in the junior college to the exclusion of other types or is he rated higher than other types.

The population involved in this investigation was small and was not randomly selected; therefore, generalizations cannot be made to a larger nonselect population. It is interesting, however, to note that the subjects failed to cluster in a single type of group or groups. Thus, the heterogeneity of the student population in the junior college would seem to be matched by the heterogeneity of first-time teachers and teaching applicants in the group studied.

IMPLICATIONS

What, then, do these investigations by Gusfield and Riesman, Friedman, and Cohen and Brawer offer for our understanding of personality characteristics of people who teach in college and universities? What bearing can such typologies have on our understanding of faculty roles and behavior in junior colleges? Certainly classifications can help us organize our thinking about people; on the other hand, they may facilitate a kind of pigeon-holing by placing people into groups in which they belong to varying degrees. The danger of stereotyping must be considered when any typology is elected for any group at all. If, however, we can become aware of the shortcomings inherent to any classification, we might be able to develop systems that aid in the selection and proper placement of individuals in positions where they may best function. Such a scheme, designed specifically for the junior college, might be outlined on the basis of faculty function, with junior college teachers representing one of four groups: "the-end-of-the-roaders," "the ladder climbers," "the job holders," and "the defined-purpose routers."

The-end-of-the-roaders might be seen as an amalgamation of Gusfield and Riesman's settlers and of Friedman's "high schoolers and profs." The designation, "end-of-the-roaders," however, is based on the actual behavior of the teacher rather than on his background, a role description similar to Riesman's. This type of instructor might come from either a high school or university position, or even directly from a role as college student. These are the people who see teaching in the junior college simultaneously as means and ends. They seek a field they can call their permanent home and they settle on it for better or for worse. This does not mean that the choice is always an elective one. Many "end-of-the-roaders" have come from the high school and imagine junior college teaching to be the epitome of success. Others, however, may have come to the junior college as a last resort because they have not been able to hold positions at four-year institutions; they have been expelled from their former positions; or they have not been able to do the research required of most college professors. They have come to the junior college as their end, but an end based not so much on choice as on necessity. The step may be quite diverse.

It is possible to conceive of the "end-of-the-roaders" as representing a rather heterogenous group rather than as people who form a clear-cut type. Membership in this hypothetical group, however, does not imply that the end-of-the-roader is necessarily a poor teacher or a good one. Many people are able to make peace with their previous lack of success and, as a matter of fact, it might even be an incentive to accomplishment. For the high schooler, the devotion to the subject matter field and to the junior college as the goal toward which he has been working, implies that he will, indeed, make the most of his teaching ability. The danger of complacency is here, as it might be for any of the groups; and again it must be noted that while classifications do in a sense suggest stereotypes, they do not imply that each person is exactly like every other person in the group.

The "ladder climbers" are probably closest to the pioneer adventurers and are more like the transient professionals than the growth stock professionals. They see the junior college as a stepping-off point for a certain period of time. Whether or not they put their "all" into their junior college careers, they hold themselves apart from those who feel that the junior college is where they will spend the rest of their professional careers. Ladder climbers may be seen as individuals who are still enrolled as university students, working toward advanced degrees. Most junior colleges insist upon the master's degree (61), and few junior college faculty hold doctorates. Some of the ladder climbers hope that after completing the doctorate, they will go on to other types of organizations—whether in higher education or in the world of industry.

Of the four groups of people described in this proposed classification, the ladder climbers are probably the most unstable in the sense of being devoted to the junior college. They might, of course, be "stable individuals" (if stable is seen as representing emotional development), but they view their junior college positions as merely transitory steps toward selected goals. In many instances, these "transitory steps" may last for decades.

The "job holders" in this schema are those previously described by Gusfield and Riesman (68). Their reasons for being interested in education vary. However, they have chosen to teach. Junior colleges present them with occupational opportunities which carry greater or lesser challenges, but their true devotion is usually to another type of field. For example, they might be artists who teach in the junior college for bread and butter, but are primarily interested in furthering their own professional careers outside the school. They might be seen as writers in the same sense, considering their job merely a 9-to-5 or 8-to-4 occupation while remaining primarily interested in family life or other personal pursuits. They are thus quite far from the university professor who takes his research home with him. Again, interpretations are tenuous; the attitude of the job holder is not necessarily one of disinterest. He may be completely involved in his work while at school and, indeed, he may be a "good teacher" in any sense of the word. He sees the job, however, only as a way to earn a certain wage or to be in a certain place at a particular time, not as an opportunity to further himself or his discipline.

The "defined purpose routers" are probably the closest to what one would hope most junior college teachers—in fact, most teachers at all levels of education—might become. They are like Heath's (78) "reasonable adventurers"—people who have found a reason for being, who have dedicated themselves to the integration of self and to the meeting of their goals. They see the junior college as a teaching institution—a place where diverse types of students come to seek satisfaction for many different kinds of needs. They are involved in their subject matter and can define it in terms of specific behavioral objectives. As noted earlier, this classification system is merely hypothetical and would require much more development before it could be considered even close to a rationale. The defined purpose routers, however, are currently seen as being closest to teachers who bring their students to goal-oriented, specified behavior (35).

SUMMARY

As the literature suggests, individual characteristics may be examined from many points of view. Some of these present fairly systematic personality descriptions that are more or less distinguished from each other and thus constitute somewhat discrete divisions. The goals for appraising types of people may be understanding, selection, prediction; the systems for classifying them may be based upon sociological, economic, psychological, or anthropological theories. The grouping of people into various subcategories on the basis of these theories thus becomes one way of viewing the literature and reducing it to workable size. However, while it is interesting and perhaps sometimes helpful in approaching better understanding, the mere classification of people does not in itself lead to building effective programs or changing curriculums. It is often difficult to distinguish one subgroup from another, especially as lines of communication increase and lines of separation decrease. Theoretical division of people into various typological structures thus becomes an interesting approach to individual and group understanding but not necessarily an avenue of implementation of results. There are other ways in which the research may be reviewed that perhaps will be more profitable for the reader and for those interested in the community college movement. These will be discussed in the following chapters.

PART II: APPLICATIONS

SELECTION

chapter 4

In order to establish a functional focus for the vast amounts of research revolving about the personality of teachers, the preceding chapters have reported selected studies dealing with general non-demographic material. Other studies, which classify traits into specific categories, have also been examined. Although these two approaches may be helpful, they are by no means exhaustive. The literature is too extensive to be viewed cursorily and, while some of it is irrelevant to junior college problems, much of it demands attention. In this portion of the monograph, those studies considered to be particularly related to faculty appraisal will be described in terms of potential usefulness.

In the sense that it isolates certain traits and disregards others, any classification of material may, of course, become a kind of typology. A classificatory scheme is proposed here based on ways in which the available literature may be used by junior college presidents, research directors, university people engaged in studies of higher education, and prospective teachers. Like any attempt to order, however, there is a danger of putting something into one category at the risk of excluding other equally important dimensions. For example, people might be described and classified by color of eyes while features such as age, sex, educational background, and hobbies may go by unheeded. In terms of the material selected for our present purposes, we might assign a particular study to one category even though it might equally fit another. Thus, although categories may be seen as somewhat interchangeable and fluid, they are used here as fairly tight groups in an effort to bring some order to otherwise unwieldy material and to gain a perspective for potential use. The selection and grouping of material may be attributed to this writer's way of looking at the research and at the particular needs of the community college. Other researchers might choose to do differently. The important point, it would seem, is that whoever reviews the literature and plans to implement changes based upon specific results and/or instigate other research, must do so with a special rationale in mind.

A RATIONALE

Since its inception, personality assessment has been used for purposes of selection—selection into or out of occupational positions, academic fields, special organizations. The concept of selection is related to the concept of prediction. It focuses on the hypothesis that certain individuals with more or less described characteristics are or are not likely to succeed in such-and-such situations under certain—again more or less defined—conditions. The absence of systematic knowledge of the special situations and the lack of criteria of effectiveness for subjects engaged in military roles were cited as two difficulties in the vast O.S.S. assessment program. Accordingly, without adequate descriptions of activities inherent in the prescribed positions and specified standards for validating predictions, even the best selection procedures can become mere exercises in personal satisfaction and dissatisfaction—with little or no attention paid to using the knowledge in future evaluation efforts.

Some work on teacher selection has added replicable, meaningful data to our slowly swelling banks of knowledge. Other studies, however, represent only halfway attempts—somewhat ambiguously defined, somewhat sketchy—toward individual understanding. As with many reports, it is difficult to draw a firm line of inclusion or exclusion. Self-selection, for example, implies that the subjects have gone through certain processes of thought (and in some cases, preparation) before deciding upon particular careers, and significant others along the way have contributed to these decisions. Conversely, while selection into initial teaching situations implies activities on the parts of others as well as the subject directly involved, it might well be that a definite commitment of self to a particular situation is actually what encourages those "others" to thereby select him.

TEACHER SELECTION

Problems of selection and omission, then, are obviously interwoven with questions of prediction. Little is known about why people choose certain fields and about the relationships of subsequent degrees of success to these decisions. Much work has been done in the area of vocational and academic counseling (149; 130; 129), but relatively little information is available today regarding the actual images or perceptions people have of various occupations. It is known, for example, that there is general agreement on which occupations hold highest prestige on various levels or scales, but little is known about the youths who enter specialized "high status" fields "while others of equal ability enter occupations with a less attractive 'public' image" (82:162). Implying the necessity for self-knowledge, Heist pointed out that

> . . . fundamental in the personal development that leads to an occupational decision is the self-perception, self-concept of the individual. The image of the expected occupational role must correspond to that of a person's self-concept (82:163).

If the concept and acceptance of self are important dimensions in the total personality picture, one might surmise that past experience plus self-image are major determinants in the decision to enter an occupation of either high or low status.

While questions of self-selection might best be left to those engaged in vocational guidance and counseling psychology, they are closely related to issues in the community college. These schools typically consider themselves to be "teaching institutions," thus implying an interest in hiring people who would be "good teachers." If potential instructors are to be attracted to and retained in college teaching, the reasons for entering teaching must be known (69). Roe (129) found that occupational interests are developed at various periods of time and that in some cases the major influences were high school teachers. Other major determinants of choice were top men in specialized fields who directed students to (and, conversely poor teachers who directed them away from) one field or another.

Gustad investigated questions about the reasons people were attracted into teaching and whether or not they remained in the profession:

> It is axiomatic in the field of personnel management that policies and practices must, if they are to have the desired effects, take into account the characteristics of the individuals and groups for whom they are designed. For many years, higher education has provided industry and governmental agencies with consultants on personnel management. It is astounding that so little has been done to apply the knowledge gained from research to the personnel practices of higher education itself. One reason for this is that there has been comparatively little research done on the campuses which would provide the facts and theoretical framework needed to improve personnel management in higher education . . . the reasons for entering must be known (69:5).

Responses from teachers currently employed, former teachers, and graduate students have suggested that individuals become college teachers because of the "kinds" of people they are—intelligent, middle class, responsible, and academically ambitious. They also believe that self-improvement requires hard work, are willing to sublimate immediate desires in favor of long-range goals, and prefer essentially solitary and intellectually stimulating activities. The college teacher sees teaching as the result of his own particular drift toward more education. Decisions about major fields of interest come earlier than decisions about how to use the acquired knowledge. Various subject matter disciplines affect decisions to teach in different ways, and teachers representing different disciplines react differently, e.g., chemists most often stress teachers' influence on their choices while psychologists are less inclined to attribute much influence to a particular source.

Eckert and Stecklien (44) investigated the career choices of 250 University of Minnesota faculty members and found that although one-fourth of the faculty members had first considered college teaching as a career while they were undergraduates, 53 per cent had not seriously considered it until after receiving their highest degrees. Only two per cent of the university faculty members had college teaching as a definite goal before they entered college.

College teachers abandon academia for various reasons, generally when their situations became intolerable. Interestingly, even among those who left college teaching, many went to great lengths to find part-time teaching opportunities. Sometimes the decision to leave was a result of inadequate salary, and sometimes due to personal or interpersonal conflicts. Gustad (69) noted that in most cases, decisions to leave teaching were difficult ones made only under extreme duress.

Selection into teaching positions is just one of the issues related to the larger problem of making occupational choices. Again it must be noted that many variables warrant consideration: the nature of the personnel, the occupational position itself, environmental demands, and the special focus of the organization. Results relevant to one situation often hardly fit the needs of another, although a superficial view of the two organizations may suggest similarities. The preceptive dean of instruction, department head, and school board member must look beneath the surface and try to objectively appraise himself and the prospective employee. Only in this way can he hope to find the essential congruencies that determine successful operations in community colleges.

PERSONALITY

Personality plays an important role in the selection of candidates for the teaching profession. The many quantitative studies that have attempted to measure and predict teaching success and the various testimonies reporting classroom observations, indicate that the teacher's personality has an educative influence and that his behavior often correlates highly with the behavior of the students (10). Symonds (151) pointed out that although it had not been demonstrated that teacher personality had an appreciable affect on achievement, there were strong indications it markedly influenced pupil adjustment.

> From what we know about personality, it appears that persons who are most successful as individuals will also be most successful as teachers. However, there is no one pattern of personality that will make the best teacher and there is every reason to believe that good teachers may exhibit many different kinds of personality traits (151:563).

Six fairly general traits were described as qualifications for the "good teacher": (1) every teacher should like teaching--the work should enable him to gain personal goals and satisfactions; (2) the "good teacher" should be personally secure as opposed to having predominant feelings of inferiority and inadequacy; (3) he must be able to identify himself with children, and have both social awareness and the capacity to enter into the feelings and interests of others; (4) he is "emotionally stable," able to accept aggression and competition; (5) he should be free from anxiety, free to experiment, and free to try innovative procedures; and (6) he cannot be too self-centered but able to give of himself freely. We are dealing with very global traits and their generality makes them difficult to measure; however, few would disagree with the importance of such qualities.

ATTITUDES

Studies concerned with attitudes of teachers to social and political issues, to their jobs and students were found to contribute significant information about teacher attitudes in general. While most of these investigations concerned teachers in areas other than higher education, the results may be of interest to the junior college instructor, dean, or general administrator. Social attitude scales tend to show teachers as being more liberal than members of the general public. Women generally become teachers because they like to work with young people, while men do so because they are primarily interested in particular subject areas (72). A report of a twenty-year sampling of teacher attitudes found that "more favorable attitudes" were expressed by elementary teachers than by secondary teachers, and attitudes distinguished between individuals rated as outstandingly poor or as outstandingly good. In a study of 5,000 teachers by the NEA Research Division (122), 66 per cent of the women urban teachers and 74 per cent of the women rural teachers reported that, if given a chance to start again, they would probably teach. Positive attitudes were expressed by only 33 per cent of the rural men teachers and 34 per cent of the urban men teachers. In a survey of 147 members of college faculties scattered from Ohio to the Pacific, Tuttle (159) found that nine out of ten teachers or professors believed their work was nominally satisfying. However, Pepper (127) felt that most teachers considered themselves to be more restricted socially than members of other leading professions, and Hunter (87) found the morale of the teachers to be "hopelessly low."

Medsker (112) found differences between teachers who did and did not adapt to the goals of the junior colleges and suggested that training experiences may be significant in the development of role-orientations and teacher-effectiveness. Thornton (155) discovered that people involved with the junior college movement and committed to its philosophy expected teachers to accept the purposes and philosophies of that institution, to view their roles with respect to students in broad perspectives, and to be student-focused. On the other hand, those who viewed the junior college teacher in the more traditional sense—as a teacher of lower-division courses preparing for further academic work—tended to expect teachers to be less accepting of the purposes and philosophies of the junior colleges and to be subject rather than student-focused.

Various inventories that measure attitude can be helpful in selecting teachers, although they often show mixed results. Budd and

Blakely (27) found that the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory was associated with the tendency to prefer extreme response positions rather than moderate response positions. This suggests, of course, that much more needs to be done to establish the fact that certain scales can validly measure teacher attitudes over a period of time, and the dean of instruction or other administrators hiring faculty for the community college must consider this. Another point for consideration is that the various instruments employed to select and predict effectiveness do not always consider sex differences. Elton and Rose (46) pointed out the need for research which compares personality factors of women as well as men in regard to vocational choice.

The attitudes of colleagues and college administrators has much to do with attitudes held by the faculty member and with his own feelings about the community college. If the general environment of the institution is student-focused, the instructors are more likely to be student-focused; if it is subject-focused, they act accordingly. This type of adjustment, however, would appear to be effective and permanent only if it is truly consistent with an individual's basic orientation. A person who professes to be student-oriented only because others are may soon revert to form. The reverse of this is true. If a school represents a definite point of view, it would seem to be most important to find teachers who already fit its philosophy rather than expect to mold them after they have been employed. Here the selection of people along dimensions essential to a prescribed viewpoint is important.

INSTITUTIONAL GOALS

Another important phase of the selection process is the delineation of specific types of academic institutions. If a school is designed to answer all needs of all people—and, indeed, there are many that attempt to do so—then it presumably follows that no one specific type of teacher is best suited to that organization. If, on the other hand, the school has a very definite orientation, it would seem that individuals congruent with that orientation would best function there. Thus, the delineation of criteria and the definition of goals appear to be essential in describing a school and in selecting particular teachers for it.

Definition of goal provides a basis for evaluation of change. It also acts as a selection device for personnel concerned with special learning institutions. When goals are defined and directions spelled out, students may know whether or not a particular course, a discipline, or even a school seems to fit their own needs and goals. Similarly, faculty thus have a basis for deciding whether a unique institution is one with which they want to be identified and to which they hopefully may be committed. A small religious school, for example, would not answer—either superficially or temporarily—the needs of an antireligious instructor. Nor would a heterogeneous public college provide a tradition-oriented, Ivy League representative with a background familiar and agreeable to him. When schools define their purposes and criteria of effectiveness, they can select teachers who best fit their needs. It then becomes difficult to separate characteristics of the school from faculty characteristics. This does not imply that students do not need a variety of instructors to serve as models (160). It does imply that schools, like people, must honestly recognize themselves and know themselves for what they are.

The community college is generally described as an institution where a heterogeneous student body meets a heterogeneous faculty (38). If this is so, it is important to organize this mix by structuring sets of definite objectives. Most junior college goals are presently so vast and so ambiguously defined that they preclude such definition. What kinds of individuals possessing what kinds of personality patterns best fit into this heterogeneous institution? In spite of the vast literature, this question is still unanswered. It has been noted that a school specialized in its orientation requires a particular kind of teacher congruent with its needs. The heterogeneous community college requires a different kind of teacher. Perhaps the only characteristic that is essential in this context is the teacher's ability to adapt to a varied type of student body with a certain degree of flexibility. Such a measure has been used as a criterion of effectiveness in a study by Cohen and Brawer (38) where supervisors' ratings of junior college interns were correlated with independent ratings on the basis of psychological tests.

Another way of determining the congruence between institutional goals and faculty orientation is to look into the various kinds of teacher training institutions attended by instructors. This may appear *post hoc* and irrelevant, but there are direct implications here for selection into special academic institutions. When teachers are prepared in schools with fairly closed-belief systems and then enter liberal and open-minded schools, they may be faced with confusion and conflict. The same is true for teachers who move from nonauthoritarian, open training institutions to narrowly oriented schools. If a particular junior college prides itself on its program of innovation, for example, it would seem that students or teachers coming from schools stressing conceptual change would be more adaptable to new procedures. Flexibility may be the key.

Another consideration in the selection of teachers for particular institutions is the perception of teaching methods as a reflection of the need structures of those promoting them. The teacher stressing the lecture method may do so because he is most familiar with it. However, in an age where he can choose from several procedures, he might better select a method which fits his own needs and if he is not aware of his own individual needs, he had better begin to discover them. Other interacting variables present a further validation of this rationale. The effectiveness of the teacher who functions as an authority figure may depend on his previous training, his own conscious needs, and his environmental situation. If the authoritarian person is thrown into a particular kind of institution, he may learn to develop a different approach—depending, of course, on the degree to which his beliefs are firmly embedded and his ability to adapt. If a person is flexible, he may be able to take on the philosophy of a school, even one incongruent with his own feeling; but in time, this kind of superficial adaptation will fail and, if the individual is true to himself, it will never be palatable.

This section on selection offers hardly a clue as to why people enter the teaching profession, and certainly none to why they specifically enter community college teaching. Some of the research already reported and other studies not yet released have implications for these questions. The important thing is to note that self-selection —one's choice of career—is a very important factor in one's whole life span. If the individual's choice is sincere, if he is open to knowledge of what the teaching situation is, if he is aware of his own strengths and shortcomings, conceivably he would be a more effective teacher in terms of conveying to his pupils a sense of knowing both material and self. The quest for self-knowledge is an ongoing one; there is no termination point for growth in terms of personal freedom and personal expansion. Much more study is necessary to know why people go into teaching and why they choose the community college as their particular focus.

The relationships of selection to preparation problems is more easily seen. Sometimes selection results from the type of preparation. At other times, deliberate selection can indicate preparation sequences that best fit the particular needs of the community college. Allen and Sutherland (5) noted that graduate schools were formerly reluctant to prepare students for college teaching and that colleges have been so unorganized in their methods of "screening, employing, and supervising new faculty members that the belated show of interest in faculty role is now an important step" (5:15). In recent years, this growing interest in preparation has been demonstrated in colleges throughout the country because

> . . . colleges are realizing that educating students is a primary function and that those who do the educating may need to be selected with increased care and given an opportunity to function effectively in their assigned role (5:15).

In an effort to assess reactions of new faculty in two institutions—a sectarian college and a private university of a different denomination—interviews were conducted with twenty teachers soon after each had reached campus to begin employment. A second interview was conducted with the same teacher eight months later. Although the number of subjects was small, the findings of this investigation are of interest:

(1) New faculty members seemed to be in congruence with the college if employment interviews were held in person with the college administrator or the departmental chairman on the campus itself.

(2) The new faculty member reacted favorably toward the college if the employment terms were made clear, in both oral and written contacts.

(3) The reactions were positive if the faculty member's responsibility was explained in terms of the college's expectations—whether these were in classroom teaching, student counseling, committee assignment, scholarly production, or community service.

(4) The response was positive if the policy and procedures of promotion, including the criteria used, were made explicit.

(5) Reactions were similarly favorable if new faculty members were made to feel at home through provision of a private office and through the welcoming attitudes of colleagues and community.

(6) The new faculty member felt congruent with the college when his integrity and individuality were respected through assurances of freedom of inquiry in teaching and of opportunity to pursue personal interests.

(7) The faculty member was

> . . . favorably disposed toward the college when the quality of the students and the intellectual stimulation of the cultural atmosphere of the college assured the new member that his own professional development was valued (5:10).

If harmonious relations existed within a department and lines of communication were kept open for the new faculty member, he felt himself to be a part of the college. If he could discuss problems with the chairman or with other administrators, it was considered helpful.

These suggestions, so general in nature that they could be applied to almost any college teaching situation, provide a feeling for the atmosphere that most schools could create. The definition of goals and the specification of expectations are feasible exercises in most institutions. This may point to an approach which many deans of instruction, department heads, and general college administrators could use in selection of teachers for their own institutions—spell it out, all of it, the good and the bad, the significant and the trivial!

TEACHER TRAINING AND PERSONALITY ASSESSMENT

chapter 5

If they are to attract specially prepared teachers, junior colleges must take the lead in encouraging four-year institutions to build special programs. This becomes increasingly important as graduate schools gear themselves more and more to research efforts and are less inclined to train teachers. With the introduction of curricular changes and the development of special training programs, however, the university and the junior college may pool their efforts in joint training ventures. It is also likely that some community colleges will combine their resources and institute training programs of their own, apart from the university affiliation. In either case, the planning of programs and the changing of courses must be based on a definite awareness of the institution's goals and of the people who are being readied to work in these organizations. Attention must be given to perceiving the individual as a unique and important part of the entire situation.

THE GENERATION GAP

The training of "good teachers" and the introduction of new programs may be hampered by various factors. In the last few years the decline of teaching quality, resulting from the stress on research activities in higher education, has been emphasized. Conversely, the "generation gap" (perhaps better called the "communication gap"), growing in part from reduced emphasis on student concerns, has found students and faculty further and further alienated from each other. This separation has been deplored by many, from administrators to undergraduates. For example, Stanford students were administered a questionnaire in which they were asked to describe some of their teachers. The men were unable to do this adequately; the women made some remarks about the teacher, but only as teacher. Neither group was able to conceptualize the teacher as a person (138). In today's world, with its explosion in student numbers, its emphasis upon specialized sciences, and its bureaucratic organization of institutions of higher education, teachers may be strangers to the students and teaching may be considered a lost art.

> Parents, no doubt others, think of education primarily as a matter of taking courses, learning content, taking examinations, and getting grades. Who perpetuates this view? I am afraid that the faculties and administrations in colleges have themselves done much to perpetuate it. Perhaps psychologists have contributed as well by treating learning as a simple accretion of more and more bits of information. Most of the psychology of learning

> deals only with how content is registered and remembered, failing to recognize that education really has more to do with unlearning, with motivation, and with relationships with teachers than with recall of facts. The perpetuation of this view has also been seen in the tasks of teacher colleges, or teacher training. Most of the training in schools of education has proceeded along the assumption that teachers are indeed transmitters of information. Therefore, skills (that) appear mandatory are stressed (and) . . . a medium is emphasized, but there are (few) opportunities for the student, teachers, or education people to become sensitive to the needs of the students (138:169).

Graduate schools pay almost no attention to teachers who are filling their students' time with specialized courses, assuming that if one can earn a master's degree or a doctorate, he can teach. Accordingly:

> There is currently in American education a marked gap between the preparation sequences experienced by elementary and secondary school teachers, on the one hand, and by senior college teachers, on the other. Certification requirements for the former group demand immersion in several courses dealing with pedagogical theory and practice. For the latter, there is no credential required other than the possession of a graduate degree in an academic discipline. There cannot be so much difference in teaching at the various levels of education that the one calls for a year or more of deliberate training to teach and the other calls for none. The difficulty experienced by students moving from high school to college may be in part a result of the fact that teachers at the two levels of education are selected differently, think of themselves as members of different professions, are trained differently, and (perhaps consequently) communicate little with each other. One preparation sequence or the other is out of phase (38:21).

Considering this lack of specific preparation for teaching, Sanford finds it surprising that

> . . . members of college faculties seldom talk about teaching—about what it is like to be in a classroom, what one is there to do, how one deals with this or that situation; they seldom mention the times when they wonder why they are even there at all—and perhaps wish they were not (138:170).

There have been some attempts to counteract this situation. The Santa Cruz campus of the University of California has been geared to creating a climate where teachers become more interested in students and where they have an opportunity "to really teach them." The experimental programs at Berkeley and the teaching internship programs at U.C.L.A. are bent in this direction, but are far from answering the needs of all students and all institutions.

TEACHER TRAINING

Although many investigations have been concerned with the relationships between teaching methods and learning, the results are seldom reported and are often disappointing. Wallen and Travers noted that

> . . . little has been done to develop teaching methods on the basis of scientific knowledge of learning. Most widely advocated teaching methods are based either on a philosophical tradition or on the personal needs of teachers. The progressive education of the 1930's found its roots in the tradition of Rousseau. Little effort has been made to design teaching methods in terms of established principles of learning. Perhaps such an effort has become feasible only within the last few decades, but prior to that time not enough was known to make possible the design of the teaching method in terms of learning principles based on research (163:466).

Teaching methods have developed largely without scientific study. Investigations comparing the effectiveness of one method with that of another can hardly be construed as constituting a program of scientific research. While there are numerous studies of teaching methods, many fail to develop a perceptual framework on which to establish criteria. This is essential for further research.

The whole area of teacher training has important implications for the junior college. The necessity for more research on teaching methods has been shown frequently. There is an allied need for research on what methods best fit students' needs, and toward this direction, longitudinal studies appear to be warranted. Dutton (43) suggested that practice teaching itself may be unduly stressful and actually a negative, critical factor in the development of teachers' attitudes towards children. That line of study demands pursuance.

Another longitudinal study stresses development at different stages of training. Palmer (126) found that seniors in teacher training courses conducted classrooms that were rather informal, whereas freshmen stressed more formal situations with the teacher standing in front. Yamamoto (170) noted changes occurring in the student as he moved from beginning to advanced standing and discussed the emphasis placed on certain qualifications in different educational areas. The implication that may be drawn here is that junior colleges might consider hiring faculty who have been trained in programs that support their own goals and objectives. MacLean, Gowan, and Gowan (101) found that education students exhibited high defensiveness in their responses to the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (109) and MacLean's extensive work in counseling psychology suggests approaches that might be adopted for training teachers. Counseling procedures, for example, might be instigated in the teacher training institutions, the professional schools, and the in-service training programs. McKeachie (107) found that students who were counseled in conjunction with their teacher training improved in their ratings more than groups without access to counseling procedures.

A study by Bowers and Soar (20) compared teachers who had laboratory experiences in human relations with teachers who did not. Classes taught by fifty-four teachers in Tennessee elementary schools were visited in a spring semester; during the summer, personality tests were administered to them. Twenty-five of the teachers then attended workshops in human relations while the remaining twenty-nine received no such specialized training. During the spring of the following year, classes taught by all the teachers were again visited and behaviors were reported. One group of findings, relating personality and attitude test scores to class behavior, showed that teachers with laboratory experiences rated higher. Along a similar line, Moore and Cole (116) found that the candidate "unsuccessful" in practice teaching does *not need* a more suitable academic major, but should seek counseling and psychotherapy to help him overcome emotional difficulties.

Attempting to discover what changes occur in teachers' training programs, Will (167) reported a study with the basic rationale that a change in the trainee occurring during his student teaching experiences would be considered an indication of growth in "emotional maturity" and "mental health." Although there were no significant changes on the basis of prescribed instruments, the differences noted in test results were in the desired directions. To assume basic personality changes over the short span of time involved in this study appears, however, to be questionable.

Another facet of the problem is the accusation that teachers are not performing their duties effectively. Perhaps there is an association here between training procedures and subsequent behavior. The gap between educational interchange and actual achievement is wide and discouraging. Conditions responsible for this gap, however, are not new or necessarily associated with today's pressures; rather they are connected with circumstances that have existed for many years. Large classes, long teaching days, inexperienced teachers, and heavy teaching assignments are not the primary causes of ineffective teaching in colleges and universities; rather, they are secondary causes which intensify them.

INEFFECTIVE TEACHING

It might be pointed out again that most teachers in post-high school positions have not been prepared to teach. Many have persisted in the assumptions that good teachers are born and, hence, cannot be made; and anyone who really *knows* a subject can teach about it because, conversely, he who doesn't know it cannot teach it. Experience, however, refutes this view. It would seem that the most important single cause of ineffective teaching, of frustration in educational efforts, is the inability of teacher training institutions to establish definite criteria for their students. Knowledge of self is as important as knowledge of subject matter. Teachers cannot be prepared only on the basis of their knowledge in a subject field or of their ability to communicate certain techniques. Without looking into the personality structure of the individual or helping him develop in a worthy fashion, we cannot say that the goal of education is individual growth and development. What the teacher is and what he lacks will be conveyed to the pupils. His own "being" must be considered.

Whether teacher education is doing anything to design curriculums conducive to the development of personal qualities is another question. What have we learned from personal involvement in civil rights, from religion, and from the various schools of psychology? Have ideas about peoples' developments and the congruence of their likes and dislikes anything to do with the education of the teacher as a person? If the qualities of a good teacher are relatively fixed, any attempt to help prospective teachers develop them during their training periods would be futile. Moreover, if this were the case, a clinician could train prospective teachers in their freshman year and save both the student and the staff considerable wear and tear in the ensuing years. If, on the other hand, these qualities are not fixed; if they can be encouraged in the prospective teacher; and if they are considered of prime importance in the development of competent teachers, experiences conducive to personal growth must be made a vital part of the teacher education curriculum.

In *Where Colleges Fail* (138) Sanford pointed out the need to provide opportunities for students to accept responsibility for their personal growth and for the development of sensitivity and acceptance of self and others. These qualities, however, are not developed in isolation but in relation to other people. We need to know much more about how they are developed and, indeed, whether they may be enhanced. It is unfortunate that

> . . . prospective teachers who lack self-actualizing qualities are not provided (with) the appropriate guidance and experiences to help them confront themselves as persons who need to grow in the direction of greater commitment and responsibility and involvement (167:472).

Some people, of course, need little help in this area. Others need a great deal. Many teachers

> . . . find the transition from the passivity of being a student to the act of involvement of being a teacher too demanding. They feel that it is unrealistic to be asked to take the responsibility for their actions, to exhibit genuine feelings, and to become actors in, rather than reactors to life (167:473).

Perhaps teacher education institutions should develop programs conducive to personal growth and, certainly to some extent, they might be able to do so. However, the development of these qualities would seem to be long-term projects which cannot be accomplished completely in schools of education or in any single college. The searches for integration and self-actualization are long, tedious projects and to use teacher preparation programs as the core for them is not possible. These characteristics should be developed if they possibly can be, but whether or not they can be taught is unknown. Certainly, they cannot be left to the educational system alone. The prospective teacher—like all people—should have opportunities for expression; but, if he thinks that he can find his answers solely in academic relationships with others, his search is leading in the wrong direction. He must first look within himself and develop as best he can, especially since this ability to develop is a private concern and dependent upon the very earliest emotional experiences encountered. There must, in any case, be a shift from the present curriculum of graduate schools of education characterized by prescription to one characterized by self-discovery. This may well aid in the development of self.

SUMMARY

Since most faculty are not especially prepared to teach, training institutions should take little credit or blame for their activities and role orientations. However, a few broad statements can be made. If a particular junior college has defined its goals, its objectives, and its reason for being, the type of college attended by its faculty might be of considerable importance. Not a great deal is known about the effects of college education upon the personal growth of students; the Jacobs Report (89) and other studies that followed have not yet found a definitive answer as to the effects of education. Building graduate programs to encourage the personal growth of the individual is a possible step towards better preparation of teachers for the junior college.

INNOVATION AND THE INDIVIDUAL

chapter 6

A NEW CONCEPT

In the last few years probably no concept has caught the fancy of educators so much as "innovation." Simultaneously, it has become an intriguing challenge and an excuse for instituting changes, a way of spending money, and a device for appeasing those who are disenchanted with old systems and are striving to establish a new order. The aura surrounding the term has charged it with a panacea-like quality. Such unqualified acceptance may concern some individuals, but many others consider innovation to be the answer to all educational problems and so ignore the importance of selection, evaluation, and longitudinal studies.

Few investigations have been made that deal with the "innovative teacher" as such, and even fewer attempt to isolate characteristics consistent with the change-minded person. To compile material for other chapters in this monograph, the literature was searched and much of it subsequently discarded because it was irrelevant, poorly reported, or carefully reviewed elsewhere as, for example, in the *Handbook of Research on Teaching* (59) and the *Encyclopedia of Educational Research* (75). In preparing this chapter, however, there was little material to report, again suggesting that many of the activities and interests in academia exist apart from research.

To successfully incorporate innovative efforts into school systems, we need to know who will accept or reject change. A major problem in assessing the acceptance or rejection of instructional media lies with the faculty who must make the ultimate decisions regarding the extent of their use.

> Dr. Bright commented that about 400 studies, all well constructed and professionally conducted, have shown that students do as well or better with instruction from a professor on TV as they do in a live classroom situation. Yet, apparently faculty are not willing to accept this and are continuing to suggest that additional studies should be made. Dr. Bright believes that this, therefore, is not a problem for hardware research, but for sociological research. He believes that the crucial question is, "What is the role of the professor if the subject is presented from an automated data file instead of by the professor? (26:7)

We need to know what conditions existed before changes were implemented and how the results of change procedures may be evaluated. To discuss innovation without evaluative measures is to deal with only a small segment of a problem and thus fail to reach a solid conclusion.

The concept of innovation seems to be closely linked with the concept of technology. Like the world of physical science which, at the start of the twentieth century, could have been described as ready to move, education today is at a similarly exciting point. New discoveries about learning and about the processes of education are imminent. The entire organization has become a powerful agent, involved with society as a whole, with government, with industry, and with all manner of agencies and institutions. The problems that beset all of us (urbanization, population explosions, communication, etc.) are mirrored in education's problems and point out the need for a dynamic approach that considers both the individual and society as a whole. Adaptation to change calls for flexibility in many areas. Should elements of flexibility be built into our teaching and learning process? While education has a long heritage of rigidity, there is a demand for flexibility since innovation suggests the ability to change and adapt to new systems and new procedures.

It is unfortunate that the constructs of innovation and flexibility have rarely lent themselves to measurement. People have attempted to measure flexibility in many ways, but overall results are difficult to report when operational definitions have not been accurately established and when the criteria—if they exist at all—vary widely (4; 37). A salient reason for the failure of flexibility as a key feature in the development of innovative practices is that the flexible teacher (the independent variable) often does not have enough freedom in his school situation to try out his own ideas. Therefore, the possible effect of these procedures upon the student (the dependent variable) is lost.

THE CREATIVE PERSONALITY

Adaptability-flexibility might be seen as a core dimension of ego strength (22). While individuals who demonstrate strong ego-functioning may not necessarily be creative, it is conceivable that creative people do possess high ego strength. There appears to be a relationship existing between certain properties of ego strength (e.g., flexibility, ability to "regress in the service of the ego") and creativity.

In the past few years, the creative personality has become almost as important a concern as the slow learner was a decade or so ago. While some research findings regarding creativity are still very much of the moment and, in many cases, only now beginning, others have been fairly well established. This information is important from several points of view, perhaps particularly to people in the schools who hire teachers and are interested in developing creative students.

In an attempt to discover teacher's conceptions about creative and ideal pupils, considerable evidence suggested that creative personalities tend to be estranged by their teachers or bosses (157). Eighty-four personality characteristics, described in approximately fifty empirical studies, compared the traits of creative individuals in certain fields with less creative people in the same field. A checklist, comprised of 62 of the original characteristics, was administered to 650 teachers in 10 different states and 7 different countries. The correlations of rated traits among the localities in the United States were very high (around .95). However, certain interesting differences were found reflecting important emphases and suggesting implications for the development of creative personalities. There was also some general regional agreement; for example, teachers in California placed higher values on senses of "beauty, versatility, spirit, vision, and spiritual disagreement" than did other groups of teachers. To a lesser degree they valued qualities of sincerity and thoroughness. Georgia teachers, on the other hand, honored "energy, obedience, and thoroughness." Other results of this investigation reported that:

1. Both teachers and parents in the United States ranked "being considerate of others" as the most important of the sixty-two characteristics which were included in the checklist.
2. The teachers placed "independence in thinking" in the second highest position of importance. This trait seems also to require independence of judgment; however, teachers in the United States did not place independence of judgment or being courageous as a mark of the ideal pupil.
3. The third ranking item by the United States teachers was determination.
4. A high rank was also assigned to curiosity.
5. Industriousness was considered an important factor. However, it is important to note that while the creative person may be industrious, his teachers may regard him as a daydreamer and as being lazy because he is not as consistently industrious as other less creative people.
6. Promptness, courtesy, and doing one's work on time were regarded as other important dimensions.

Certain characteristics were frequently punished or discouraged by teachers, and thus rated at the bottom; for example,

1. Highly creative individuals regress occasionally. This was not considered to be "correct."
2. Highly creative individuals are sometimes emotional, sometimes critical of others, stubborn, negativistic, and may often appear to be domineering, especially when they are creating ideas. They may also have an unusual talent for disturbing the organization wherever they find it.

From the junior college's point of view, it might be asked, "How does the creative person fit into the school." We say, on the one hand, that we want "creative individuals who are able to function well" and we value this. On the other hand, we find the creative individual is often very difficult to deal with, and we may not allow him his "transgressions."

Further complicating the picture is the fact that there is no single consistent pattern which researchers can draw as a prototype of the highly creative individual. In fact, there are many contradictions and incongruities among the profiles that might be drawn. From the numerous studies of the highly creative person, it appears that he is as complex as the creative process itself (81; 102). It is therefore erroneous to assume that one stable set of characteristics alone can be considered when studying creative individuals and the creative process or when attempting to develop creative behavior in the administration, the faculty, or community college students.

> Such preconceptions of the personality of the creative individual are one reason teachers have difficulty in selecting and understanding those pupils who possess considerable creative potential. When attempting to deal with personality problems, teachers should be aware of creative students' frequent inconsistencies and contradictions in character (168:177).

Teachers need to be trained to recognize and develop creativity and to be innovative in themselves. They also need freedom to experiment with the involved concepts and the diversions of thinking if they are then to allow these processes to be developed more fully in school classrooms—a big charge for the teacher and for the dean of instruction who is hiring his faculty. With all this search for creativity, however, the role of creative thinking, special abilities, and social/personal interactions has generated only a limited amount of research. There are few studies concerned with the relationships existing between creative ability in adults and their differential effectiveness as teachers with students who themselves differ in their degree and kind of creativeness. There may well be some indication that creative teachers do show certain characteristic reaction patterns toward the world and that they affect their pupils in particular ways (170). However, these issues still require investigation.

Whatever the conditions that encourage flexibility and creativity, if the environment encourages or, better still, promotes flexible behavior, and if individuals can be encouraged to exhibit uniqueness by allowing them to execute their own strengths, new ideas may be tried out and creativity encouraged. This, of course, does not imply a limitation to creativity in terms of artistic expression. There are all kinds of creativity in all sorts of situations that may be developed. These results, these new ideas put into action, and the subsequent changes, may then be measured and evaluated.

AUTHORITARIANISM

While conditions that encourage flexible behavior or creative output in the individual are not yet known and while requisites for promoting the development of innovative ideas have yet to be discovered, we do know one rather encompassing dimension that discourages these processes. Stereotyped and conventional thinking, lack of original responses to projective techniques, crude generalizations, compulsive behavior, criticalness, and emotional inhibition characterized individuals whom Frenkel-Brunswik and Sanford (54) and Spiegelman (146) described as holding common prejudices which served as an integrating function. This type of person was later designated as "the authoritarian personality" (4).

There has been a considerable amount of work developed from earlier studies of the authoritarian personality. In three experiments, for example, it was found that less intelligent students did consistently better in group problem-solving situations conducted in an authoritarian manner than in groups which were conducted in a permissive manner. The same differences did not occur, however, for bright students (29). Certain personality characteristics of teachers were still found to be affecting pupils' behavior the year following their exposure to them. Dominative behavior on the part of teachers tended to create unhappiness and frustration in students who consequently tended to the extremes of resistance and conformity and were less spontaneous than students who had been exposed to other types of teachers (10).

It would appear that

> . . . ego development is hampered both by authoritarian or overprotective regimes and by permissive-chaotic ones. The former do not give the synthesizing functions of the ego a chance for exercise; the latter, through too much stimulation of impulse with consequent anxiety, may put too heavy a strain upon the developing ego (139:288).

Development of the ego seems to be facilitated by things which free the individual from the necessity of defensive operations. Difficult and anxiety-provoking situations force him to fall back on primitive defensive maneuvers which thus deter him from further strengthening of the ego. Conversely, ego functions do improve when their performance meets with success in increasingly difficult situations. The college situation offers many opportunities for acquiring skills and techniques which build self-confidence; consequently, they may augment the further development of the ego functions.

> Teaching can make a contribution by giving the student a glimpse of the variety and complexity of the social world, thus showing how people feel and what it means to be human, by forcing self-awareness through empathy with many kinds of people, real and fictional, by confronting the student with some of the deficiencies of his old automatically adopted values and, thus enducing conflict and requiring decisions . . . But college is not always the perfect culture for the ego. There may be authoritarianism in teaching, with rewards for doing precisely what one is told, or authoritarianism in the regime—perhaps in the student government—with its invitations to substitute external control for inner direction (139:288).

"Warm teacher scales," developed from certain personality inventories and discriminating between "good" and "poor" teachers, were found to relate with the "F" scale developed by Adorno, *et al.* (4) upon the concept of the authoritarian personality. In a study by Sheldon, Coale, and Copple (140) those teachers who scored highest on "warm teaching" measures scored lowest in authoritarianism. Authoritarian tendencies in teacher-pupil relations also have been related to antidemocratic attitudes and to the authoritarian person in general.

Placing the essential issues of teacher personality within psychological as well as psychometic theory and thought, McGee (106) found that the enduring forces of personality are not responses but readiness for response. Whether or not the readiness will ensure overt expression depends not only upon the situation of the moment but upon what other readiness stands in opposition to it. Among the readinesses of special relevance to the classroom are authoritarian or equalitarian teacher attitudes that might be measured in overt behavior and related to student responses.

Change can come about by trial and error, by defining outcomes, and by trying different ways to see if these outcomes may be achieved. To be a truly successful innovator, one must be able to check results, to know how to change people's behavior, and to get them thinking and acting in new ways. This requires that the flexible individual, who is aware of other people's needs, be put into positions where he can make decisions regarding whether or not changes in a given situation appear desirable, what type of changes are most needed, and how these changes may be brought about.

CONCEPTIONS OF FACULTY ROLES

chapter 7

It is interesting to note that in this age of specialization the term "teaching" is still used to cover a multitude of functions, all subsumed under one name. The word probably embraces as many individual and separate functions as any single concept—functions that generally apply to varied and often conflicting activities. Recently there have been efforts to describe the act of teaching in terms of role theory, although the fact that "role" may be defined from several different standpoints sometimes hampers its implementation as a working tool.

DEFINITION

Role may be described as the pattern or type of behavior that an individual builds according to what others expect of him. Thus one assumes the role of teacher in terms of classroom lecturer because he expects that others see him functioning in a certain manner, or he acts as judge and distributor of fines (translated as poor or failing course grades) because he expects that others see the teacher as the manipulator of destiny, as punisher of behavior falling short of expectation, and as overall judge. Murphy (119) used the concept of role in his theory of personality, describing it as a more or less fixed way of behaving forced on the individual by his culture and emphasizing the importance of role interaction.

Kelly defined role in terms of his theory of personal constructs, as

> . . . a psychological process based upon the role player's construction of aspects of the construction systems of those with whom he attempts to join in a social enterprise . . . a role is an on-going pattern of behavior that follows from a person's understanding of how the others who are associating with him in his task think. In idiomatic language, a role is a position that one can play on a certain team without even waiting for the signals (93:97-98).

While this definition of role assumes that it is tied to one's personal construct system and therefore anchored in the outlook of the player, Kelly noted that seeing oneself as playing a role is not equivalent to identifying oneself as a "static entity." Rather, role refers to a process or ongoing activity carried on in relation to other people. This concept is appropriate to a psychological system concerned with the individual, but it is also dependent on cognate developments within a group. Therefore, role may be conceptualized as being dependent on a social process, and in terms of the educational organization, it implies a relationship between teacher and pupils, teacher and colleagues, and teacher and administrators.

Buxton (28) defined the academic role as a composite picture of the functions a particular person fills in his department or institution. He suggested that roles need to be established and that there is evidently much specialization of function by certain staff members, in division of labor, in responsibility, etc. Roles, like status signs, may be defined in numerous ways, their assigned weights varying with institutions and sometimes with the individual himself. Any or all functions may serve to define the role: the courses the instructor teaches, the research area where he functions, his special skills. There are, of course, other teacher roles: curriculum work, lecturing, dealing with nonacademic groups, directing and stimulating undergraduate research, tutorial advisement of students, administration of interdepartmental programs, and lecturing at colloquies. Again it becomes apparent that the words "teacher" and "professor" include a variety of functions that both complement and compliment with each other, thus adding to the stress and complexity of actual teaching performance.

Others describe role in different ways. Symonds (152), for example, saw the teaching role in terms of an interaction with adults in the community as well as with the students. Adult-relationship roles of the teacher were delineated as those of employee, subordinate to the principal, adviser to superiors or colleagues, follower, and leader. Pupil-relationship roles of the teacher, on the other hand, were mediators of learning, disciplinarian, parent substitute, confidant, and surrogate of middle class morality.

Problems arising when a teacher assumes the role or behavioral patterns of the therapist were also reviewed by Symonds (150), who pointed out the coincidence of the two patterns. Although the teacher cannot carry out the therapeutic role in areas of behavior, there is a common denominator in terms of process. Both teaching and therapy are expected to lead to change in behavior or condition. In therapy, the ends may be defined only generally—the individuation process, complete integration, self-actualization. In education, teaching should lead to specific behavior changes predicated on the basis of defensible objectives. In order to assess the teaching process, development toward specific ends must be demonstrated. On the other hand, the therapist moves along with the client or analysand as he progresses and develops.

Problems also develop when college instructors teaching remedial classes find they have a role different from other instructors.

> To teach a remedial developmental course does not identify remedial teachers with higher education, whereas teaching specialized and advanced courses affords instructors personal and professional prestige (132:170).

The feeling that teaching low-achievement students is not actually college teaching implies that it is a separate kind of role. Perhaps such instructors might be considered in terms of performing specialized functions and thus adopting unique roles.

Until the 1950's, teacher behavior was generally described on the basis of fairly limited personality characteristics. Recently, more comprehensive ways to classify the behavior of faculty have been employed. Accordingly, teachers' roles may be described in different ways, although all are based on the underlying assumptions of role theory that: (1) each individual plays a number of roles; (2) the role expectations held by individuals or defined by other members of a group are related to the individual's position in a given social system; (3) the location of the occupant's position in the social system affects the nature of the social relationships as well as his role expectations; (4) role expectations may emanate from a broader society—from the reference-group members or from the individual's self-perception of the situation. Human social behavior may, accordingly, be seen as a function of both the positions occupied by the individual and his perception of the role expectations held by incumbents of this position.

It is possible that we are looking in the wrong way and in the wrong places for methods of predicting teacher behavior. Perhaps role theory has something to offer to our understanding of actual teaching situations. The research on teacher characteristics is extensive; the research in terms of specific role is more limited because the rationale itself is fairly recent. Role theory and the different functions in which a teacher engages might be examined separately but to do so, we had better define the function, isolate the particular role, and then look to other areas for information about what constitutes an effective person performing in a certain way. For example, if we think in terms of the specific teacher and his role as administrator of curriculum or even as a classroom administrator, then organizational information—the material we get from behavioral sciences—may be fruitful for further investigation. Assessment of high-level personnel might be as important for looking at top-level academic people as it is in industry. If we then think in terms of specific function, we might find that we are limiting ourselves when we confine our search only to teachers. Other occupational roles, other functions similar to teaching, may provide some of the answers.

Halpin (74) developed a paradigm for research on administrative behavior that has implications for the teaching profession and specifically for the teacher doing administrative work. This design consisted of four panels or units that included the organization task, the administrative behavior, the variables associated with this behavior, and the criteria for administrative effectiveness.

Perhaps one of the greatest causes of conflict between administrators and faculty is the incongruent perception of role demands and role performance. Role demands are what the teacher is supposed to do to carry out the formal educational program; they arise out of certain traditions, ideologies, social organizations of the college, and cultural climate. Role performance is what he actually does; this is not always consistent with the role demands, although it is generally determined by them. Another determinant of role performance is the teacher's perception of the role demands. He may—and perhaps does—see them in quite a different way from the administrator or organizational force dictating them. This manner of viewing may then be defined as the role dispositions, and these may be considered the determinants of an individual's role performance, his abilities, personality traits, and the physical and social characteristics he brings to the task (100).

The American teacher of undergraduate students has conflicting demands made upon him. He is expected to be a cross between a high school teacher, a research man, a chaperon, and a personal and public relations counselor. This creates conflict among what faculty members have to do, what they would like to do, and what is interpreted as rewarding. The same conflict applies to selection processes where the perception of the role largely determines both the concept of preparation for it and the type of person who seems to be best suited to it. However, perceptions vary—ask any psychologist! Generally, the literature disseminated by colleges implies that good teachers are born and therefore the roles thrust upon them are consistent and constant. Although all colleges tend to boast about their good teachers, the good teacher is seldom described and no hint is given as to how he got that way. There is seldom recognition of personality differences, different conceptions of role demands, and different ways in which the various teaching functions will be performed.

APPLICATIONS OF ROLE THEORY

Perhaps role theory can best be used by the junior college to develop a more perceptive understanding of individuals who function in its many institutions, to select specialists for particular occupational tasks, and to form a rationale for research concerned with academic planning. Sorenson, Husek, and Yu (143) suggested that it may be a potentially important approach for the investigation of teacher behavior and teacher effectiveness. They presented a design to assess teacher role expectations in terms of six dimensions; information-giver, disciplinarian, advisor, counselor, motivator, and referrer. These six factors were analyzed and a basis was provided for a revised test that was then administered to students working for teaching credentials at the U.C.L.A. School of Education; the results provided a basis for using five of the six original factors in further research.

Kinney (95) developed a classification of teacher roles that was later extended by Fishburn (51). Again teacher's activities were seen in terms of six specific roles: learning director, guidance counselor, mediator of the culture, member of the school community, liaison between school and community, and member of the profession. Kinney assumed that the good teacher would function in all these roles; Fishburn, believing that a person strong in one area may not necessarily be strong in another, saw the roles as fairly distinct. This particular interpretation of the role concept appears relevant to understanding the teacher in the community college. Perhaps in order to know the teacher, he must be considered in terms of specific functions rather than as a representative of many functions, especially since it is difficult (perhaps impossible) for him to perform consistently in every function and to meet every demand equally well.

Another classification of teacher behavior as a function of the role concept was described by Havighurst and Newgarten (77). They discussed a three-dimensional process whereby behavior is related to other adults in the school system and to the pupils.

The concept of team teaching divides the many functions of the teacher into specific roles. In order to collect descriptive data on team teaching programs, a survey tentatively identified teachers as adapting well and adapting poorly to such a program (17). Data collected from 533 team members and 242 principals of various schools suggested that a large proportion of team teaching programs were quite new. Strong leaders with definite administrative responsibilities were found only in a minority of the teams. It was suggested that in order to be effective in team teaching, such individual characteristics as flexibility, ability to cooperate and work effectively with other adults, consideration of others, organizational skills, and ability to accept constructive criticism are all important dimensions.

With the growth of both teacher and student activism, it might be seen that the teacher's role has more clearly moved away from one of authority and that it is still undergoing an important transition. Perhaps definition of the types of roles played by teachers might facilitate better understanding of the many functions associated with the teaching profession. It might be also appropriate to think of separating the various roles just as courses are separated—dependent, of course, upon prior analysis and description. Further, it might be conceivable to consider separately a teacher who lectures, a teacher who is concerned with test building, a teacher who engages in tutorial interchange with his pupils, etc. This conceptual approach has many possibilities. If we understand that personalities vary and that characteristics of the effective teacher may, indeed, be quite different, we are then in a position to look into the problem of discovering what kinds of teachers best perform what specific functions. This, of course, is a recommendation for the greater specialization of the teaching profession. It appears worth considering whether or not such an approach might have value for the further understanding of faculty and the better functioning of junior colleges.

On the other hand, as suggested by Cohen and Brawer (37), if the teacher is seen as performer of all functions, he must then be a flexible-adaptable kind of person who can jump from one type of role activity to another. Perhaps he can best be likened to an actor who dons many masks and is able to enact various roles with a certain amount of abandon. Although flexibility is an important ingredient of the well-functioning personality, an unrelated kind of adaptation to all roles appears unsatisfactory since it is most probable that the effective individual must eventually be himself and must "do his own thing."

TEACHER-STUDENT INTERACTIONS

chapter 8

This chapter examines some of the research relevant to teacher-student interactions in order to discover whether any seeds of discontent, avenues for improvement, or ways of approaching these relationships may have potential usefulness for the community college. A few of the studies appear to be directly related to this institution; others require some sort of "thought translation" in the sense that functional developments may proceed from theoretical findings when consideration of results is combined with creative planning. Still other studies appear to be interesting but far-fetched; their direct implications must be held for future research projects. Those investigations reported here are divided into only a few of the possible ways teacher-student interactions might be categorized.

Nevitt Sanford very aptly set the scene for this discussion when he stated:

> The characteristics of individual teachers are important not only because they help determine the teacher's role-conceptions and role-performances, but also because activities expressive of these characteristics may affect students directly. Relevant characteristics of teachers are ability, knowledge, attitudes, values, and other traits of personality; and such physical and social attributes as sex, age, training, experience, social class and ethnic background. Very little is known about the influence of college teachers' characteristics upon students' learning and development. Although studies of this aspect of the educational process have been carried on in the elementary and high schools, almost nothing has been done in the colleges. Here is a vast and significant area that awaits investigation (137:54).

A major reason for this delay in developing systematic knowledge of teacher-student relationships is that such information has awaited —and still awaits—the emergence of a serviceable psychology of personality development in students. To understand the processes of teacher-student interaction, it is necessary to delve into the personality functioning of both parties. "Although these matters are often intuitively familiar to the sensitive college teacher, they do not often find their way into the educational literature" (137:54).

Notwithstanding the lack of consensus on the impact of the college years, Jacobs (89) found, from student testimony and observations by educators and counselors, that profound influence was exerted by some teachers—even to the point of causing certain students to reorient their philosophies of life. The influence that ignited "the certain spark," however, could hardly be identified because it is personal, varied, and often unconscious. Faculty who are seen as having this power with students are likely to be individuals whose own value commitments are firm and openly expressed, and who are outgoing and warm in their relationships. Their influences are more pronounced in institutions where associations between faculty and students are frequent and where students find their teachers receptive and unhurried in their classroom conversations. Student values do change to some extent in college and with some, change is substantial. However, little is known about curricular patterns that stimulate change, nor is there yet a model for "the perfect teacher."

INTERACTIONAL SYSTEMS

Since the early 1950's a number of researchers have focused their attention on teacher-pupil interactions in the classroom. This process was described by Bales (12) as occurring when two or more persons behave overtly toward one another so that each receives some impression distinct enough to induce a certain reaction. Systems for observing teacher-pupil interactions are manifold; some contain major categories for such variables as content, analysis, emotional meanings, cognitive memory, and conversion thinking (15; 153). Effective systems have been explored by Amidon and Flanders (9) with teacher behavior examined in terms of such dimensions as feeling-acceptance, praise, questions, student responses, silence, and negative classroom atmosphere.

Multidimensional designs have been used to record emotional climates, verbal emphases, and social organizations in classrooms, while teacher-student interchanges have been pictured in terms of the "classroom game" (15; 110). A rule for teachers playing this game is that they look upon themselves as the single most active person in the classroom; a rule for pupils is that there "primary task" is responding to the "teacher's solicitations." Flanders and his associates (9; 52; 53) presented data on teacher-pupil interaction patterns in the seventh and eighth grades, while Spaulding (144) described types of teacher activities relevant to pupil productions.

Pupil perception, teacher perception, and perception of trained outside observers regarding the four dimensions of classroom activities—development, mental health, group processes, and achievement —were examined in a study by Morse, Bloom, and Dunn (117). An extensive investigation by Ryans (133; 134) involving many elementary and secondary schools established correlations among three dimensions of teacher behavior: friendly vs. aloof; businesslike vs. slipshod; and stimulating vs. dull. The data yielded high intercorrelations in elementary teaching, but low correlations in the secondary schools. What they would be for junior college and university-level teaching can only be speculative.

On the basis of interview and admissions data, Wilk and Edson (165) found that counselors were unable to identify individuals who exhibited "integrative" student teaching behavior. These results generally suggested that although there appear to be some definite patterns of teacher-pupil interactions that might be objectively observed, there are yet no clear-cut answers. Furthermore, little research has been conducted on teacher-student relationships at the college level.

In any situation where subjective judgments are called for, characteristics of the evaluator must be considered. Descriptions vary and ratings are established on different scales, but all depend on several variables—e.g., the particular needs and expectations of the rater, his own personality, his background. Reitz, Very, and Guthrie (128) were specifically interested in discovering whether descriptions of ideal teacher-student relationships offered by university teachers would be similar to descriptions of ideal therapeutic relationships made by trained therapists. An attempt was also made to discover whether content, length of teaching experience and, to some extent, technique, would reflect the teacher's belief about the nature of the ideal teaching relations. An experienced and a novice group of teachers from six colleges within the Pennsylvania State University were asked to describe by means of a seventy-five item Q-sort, their conception of the ideal undergraduate teacher-student relationship. The results of this research suggested that: (1) scores earned by experienced teachers correlated more highly with each other across the six schools studied than did scores of experienced teachers of a given college with novices within that same college, and (2) scores of experienced teachers correlated more highly among themselves. Expertness and experience were found to influence the types of relationships a teacher sets as goals, with teachers generally agreeing on the ideal teacher-student relationship. Moreover, experienced teachers agreed more closely among themselves than with therapists. In relation to the community college, it would be interesting to learn what difficulties exist not only for experienced and novice teachers but also for the "high-schoolers," "profs," and "grads," as categorized by Friedman (56).

Ackerman (1) analyzed selected studies carried out at the University of Wisconsin under the leadership of Barr (13). His major criticism of the investigations reviewed was that the concept of trait is meaningless unless it can be anchored to observable behavior of classroom teachers and teacher-pupil interactions. Such a reaction might find some support, but it should not imply general agreement. Classroom interactions—as any human interaction—may vary from day to day; they are not necessarily constant. Further, observable behavior may not show that students have profited from classroom interactions; that they have learned in the sense of changing their own behavior as a direct result of the school experience.

One factor described as "culture"—the compilation of artistic, polished, imaginative, and effectively intelligent traits—was found to relate highest to peer evaluations in a study at the University of

Michigan (88). In still another attempt to assess teachers' characteristics on the basis of student ratings, a questionnaire was sent to 150 college graduates scattered over the country. They were asked to describe the teaching they had received at the undergraduate level, to select the best- and least-liked teachers, and to state if either were also the best instructor (164). The "best-liked" teachers were characterized as "cheerful," "happy," "good-natured and jolly," "giving students a chance to make up work," "human," "friendly." Teachers rated as "best instructors" but not "best-liked" were found to be primarily effective speakers who "stood up when they talked." It was concluded that the major difference between the best-liked teacher and the best instructor was one of "human qualities." Here again there are indications of the tendency to generalize excessively from what might have been much more specific data.

Very and Dye (161) found that students uniformly saw the "real" teacher as being independent, forceful, reluctant to take decisive action, firm in opinions, domineering, and without respect for the points of views held by others. The faculty respondents, however, were less uniform in their evaluations, some describing themselves as being similar to the students' descriptions while others took the opposite pole and depicted the "real" faculty member as one with a strong need to help others, self-confident, and possessing the abilities to be social, charming, and enthusiastic. Again, we find the importance of ratings tied to the assessor himself; in order to evaluate what someone says, one must look at that someone. Teacher-student evaluations may have much to say but all of the variables must be considered before one can really understand what is being said and by whom.

THERAPY—TEACHING PARALLELS

Although the number of similarities in the relationships of pupils to teachers and of clients to psychotherapists may or may not equal the differences, certainly one way to look at the pupil-teacher interaction is in terms of client and therapist. Such efforts have been described by Fiedler, Heine, Rogers, and Super. Rogers (131) suggested that there are common characteristics in such human-helping relationships as counseling, supervision, therapy, and teaching. Heine (80) compared the factors in therapeutic experiences of subjects treated by professionals affiliated with three different schools of therapy and isolated certain primary therapeutic agents as factors common to all schools. Fiedler (49) administered a seventy-five item Q-sort to describe the ideal therapeutic relationship and found that therapists of different schools differed in their descriptions. However, the ability to describe this concept was interpreted as being a function of experience and it was concluded that therapeutic relationships may be but a variation of good interpersonal relationships in general. Super's (149) work with this same Q-sort resulted in a correlation of .81 between the good teachers and the therapists' composite sort. Perhaps it is unfair to compare education with psychotherapy—an applied art that seeks deliberately to change the person—because, although results of psychotherapy may be disappointing, it has a general rationale and failures may be understood and made the basis for improvement (138). Education, on the other hand, does not always function with a specified rationale. The critical difference between psychotherapists and educators, as seen by Sanford, is that a teacher uses

> . . . student transference not like the therapist, as a means for giving the student insight into himself, but as a source of motivation for his intellectual work (138:59-60).

CLASSROOM INTERACTIONS

This chapter has already discussed student ratings of their teachers and certain parallels of teaching and therapeutic situations. Pupils and students have also been studied in terms of social interactions in the classroom. This line of inquiry includes sociometric studies of group structures and their effects, child development, and social emotional climates of the classrooms. More recently, research on classroom interaction has emphasized interpersonal perceptions in social climates and teacher-leadership styles. The teaching act also has been the focus of several studies on the assumption that, for a predictive theory to evolve, the phenomenon must first be described and analyzed. Specimen records of teachers interacting with children during specified classroom periods have been collected, as have observational techniques that assess the spontaneous behavior of the teacher (52). At the University of Illinois, in an effort to illustrate both sound and unsound logical hypotheses in the teaching act, Smith (141) developed a system of analysis that isolated examples of classroom communication. Ryan's (133; 134) large scale attempts to assess teaching characteristics from rating scales, referred to earlier, included specific observations of teaching situations. He found three patterns of teacher dimensions: friendly, understanding, and sympathetic vs. aloof, egocentric, and restricted; responsible, systematic, and business-like vs. unplanned and slipshod; stimulating, imaginative, and surgent vs. dull and routine. Heil (79) and associates categorized children and different types of teachers to discover what kinds of teachers had what kinds of effects on children. The teachers were classified on the basis of classroom observations, responses to an interest-personality inventory, role-playing, and their scores on an educational examination. Only the interest schedule yielded clear results, verifying the major hypothesis that different kinds of teachers get different kinds of achievement from different kinds of children. The self-controlling individual was found to stimulate the most achievement from certain children; the fearful teacher was associated with the least achievement. With children classified as conformers and strivers, the turbulent teacher was almost as successful as the self-controlling one, but less than half as successful with children classified as opposers. There was no one kind of teacher who did well with all kinds of students or one kind of student who did well with all kinds of teachers.

Still the search continues! Filson (50) suggested that when learning goals were ambiguous, lecturing and giving directions increased the dependence of pupils on the teacher. Anderson and Brewer (10) were concerned with teachers classified as dominative, anti-integrative and integrative.

LEARNING GAIN

Gordon, Adler, and McNeil (65) investigated the concept of teacher leadership as portrayed by task authority and expressive dimensions. Effects on the pupil were described in terms of productivity, compliance, volunteer work and classroom order. Seventy-nine teachers of sixth, seventh, and eighth grades and 2,700 pupils were studied. Pupil productivity, morale and compliance were analyzed in terms of the teachers' leadership in order to discover: (1) whether the teacher showing the greatest total learning gain also achieved the highest morale or compliance in his class, and (2) whether the various effects of gain, morale, and compliance were related to the modes of teacher leadership. It was found that learning gain was least related to the other variables and that volunteer work was most highly related.

> . . . those forms of leadership which achieve compliance over and above the demands of the system also tend to maximize compliance of the demands of the system if you learn to work and conform to the norms of the class order (65:259).

TEACHER-STUDENT RELATIONSHIPS

The storm instigated by the free speech protagonists at Berkeley has been echoed by other students in other institutions who protest the alleged indifference, incompetence, and inadequacy of their instructors. In one sense, the community college has been only a spectator to such events. The relation between students and faculty at these schools has not stimulated the furors of discontent and academic exasperation that the tensions at the larger universities have aggravated. Lest administrators and other community college personnel become complacent, it must be pointed out that human interactions are tenuous at best and that freshmen and sophomores in junior college may readily identify with their peer groups at larger universities. Such identification could conceivably result in dissatisfaction and protest.

Previous reviews of the literature have described the use of various measures to characterize personality constellations of teachers at all levels of education. Most of these investigations have been concerned with elementary and secondary school personnel; only a few with faculty in higher education. Some of these studies discuss general personality dimensions of teachers isolated from their students, colleagues, and from the general pressures emanating from their environments. Other studies have dealt with relations between students and teachers; between those individuals judged successful and those judged unsuccessful; and between administrators and teachers. Occasionally—but very occasionally—research has considered the teacher as he interacts with his students in a prescribed environment—a type of investigation which would seem to portend considerable value for the future.

Another examination of student-teacher relationships considered the instructor's general influence on the student. Although much of the research in mental health education has been exploratory and informal, it is believed that the school does contribute to the formation of student attitudes and that

> . . . effective personal interaction is not alone by direct . . . teaching about human behavior but also by creating and maintaining a stable social microcosm in which . . . wholesome human relations are the accepted order (18:223).

Relationships of personality characteristics between teachers and pupils might be likened to the relationships of analysts and analysands on dimensions of introversion and extraversion as reported by Brawer (23) and Brawer and Spiegelman (25). The interaction of affiliation cues with affiliation needs in determining achievement in a college class has also been reported (107). In three separate studies it was found that men high in affiliation needs made relatively better grades in classes with high levels of affiliation cues. Here again we find the general influence of the teacher upon the pupil.

THE MODEL TEACHER

The difficulty in thinking of the teacher as a model in a dispassionate way is pointed out by Adelson (2), who noted that this theme is likely to be charged with emotion. While teachers in the past may have been concerned with this ideal of themselves as models, it is more likely today that teachers make light of such potential. What do we really mean by "becoming like" a particular model? What is the teacher's part in this "process of identification?" Does the student accept the teacher's ego qualities? Are the intellectual demands of the topic met by the concept of identification?

For some answers, we might turn to the concept of identity as described by Erikson (48). In many cases, students will resist the identity of the teacher as a model because it is too tempting. In other cases, students who seem untouched may be in a kind of "moratorium"—in terms of Erikson's thinking—waiting for the proper time to pledge commitment but not yet ready for a personal ideal. Other students shop around for models, not merely aping a teacher's mannerisms and tricks, not assuming the irrelevant qualities of the professor role, and not abandoning his own resources to incorporate them. All of this, of course, depends upon the student's own identity percepts and his needs, as well as the percepts and needs of the professor. Adelson concluded:

> Discussions of a good teacher are likely to leave us more uplifted than enlightened. The discussions generally amount to a little more than the assemblage of virtues; we miss in them a sense of complexity and ambiguity that we know to characterize a teacher's singular work. There are some paradoxes . . . a teacher may be a good teacher and yet not serve as a model to any of his students; he may inspire students and yet fail to influence them; he may influence them without inspiring them; he may be a model for them and yet be an accepted teacher; etc. (2:405-406).

Some conceptions of education have moved forward on the assumption that there is in existence a distinguished body of subject matter, the mastery of which constitutes an education. Educational programs, methods of teaching, teacher attitudes, and means of evaluations are all based on the assumption that knowledge is power. If the pupils learn the facts and acquire the skills (as measured by examination), the teacher judges himself successful, taking no account of the impact of teaching on students' personalities. An alternative view conceives of education as a process whereby the individual realizes all that he is capable of becoming. The teacher, accepting the uniqueness of each individual's personality, sees his task as a process of releasing creative talents. The learning of practical skills thus becomes only a means to an end, not an educational end in itself; and any knowledge acquired at the expense of personality maladjustment would be viewed as an educational acquisition for which too high a price has been paid. Examining current educational programs, we find that the personality-based conceptions described above are more prevalent in the kindergarten, nursery, and lower grades than in the upper grades, high school, or college. The higher we go on the educational ladder, the more damaging the effects may be upon the personalities of those individuals involved. Such a sweeping generalization, of course, demands qualification and exception. The difficulty in understanding reasons for the sharp lag between the best knowledge and current practice in education may be due to the fact that, while in medical practice it is a professional advantage to use the latest devices, in teaching it takes a good deal of courage to adopt new methods. Often the teacher who does so will be in serious trouble as a result. Melby pointed out that

> . . . one of our greatest difficulties in education comes from our failure to realize the peculiar character of our education proc-

> ess. Our profession is, perhaps, the only one in which the practitioner can know all he should know and do everything he should do and yet fail. You can be an authority on the various kinds of knowledge there is in teaching and yet have a bad impact upon the personalities and the development of the children with whom you come in contact (113:857).

The problems of the impact of educational programs on educational development may largely be related to equipping teachers with a keen awareness of human personality uniqueness, faith in children and people generally, and a fundamental attitude of truth in research efforts.

Thistlethwaite reported that college press generally influences a student's motivations to seek advanced training. From a sample of 2,405 undergraduate men, he confirmed some previous research findings and stated that men

> . . . who report that their teachers exert strong press for enthusiasm, humanism, affiliation, independence, achievement, and supportiveness, or who exert weak tests for compliance, tend to raise their aspirations for advanced training more than men not reporting such press (154:310).

McKeachie (107) pointed out that of the many studies regarding teacher-student interaction, some boil down to the fact that different types of students relate to and learn better from different types of instructors or through different means of learning. This, of course, implies that to determine the most effective teaching, we have to investigate thoroughly the characteristics of the students, to find out what methods of teaching the teacher employs, and what type of personality he has. Of course this also depends upon the type of learning involved since it is likely that different learning situations demand different things from a student and, therefore, require various kinds of instructors.

SUMMARY

This chapter has reviewed several dimensions in teacher-student interactions. Ratings of teachers by students have pointed to rather general traits and classroom assessments have been discussed in terms of social systems. The authoritarian teacher and his effect upon students, the creative pupil and his relationship to teachers, and the general influence of teacher on pupil has been pointed out. Thus we note that although much must yet be done about the reaction of students to teachers and teachers to students, it is a powerful force that needs consideration. In time, the effect of the teacher may diminish. Teaching machines, large group discussions, the tutorial method, etc., may well affect some of the interactions currently existing. On the other hand, these same media might leave the teacher more time to relate to a student on a one-to-one basis. Just what the future brings cannot be ascertained now. However, as we learn more about the effects of teacher-student interaction or lack of interaction, as we better understand the characteristics of the student and of the teacher, we will no doubt be in better positions to judge which teaching method, if any, is superior to another.

PART III: A FINAL LOOK

REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS

chapter 9

The invasion of personality assessment into the field of education brings classic interest in human behavior to structured institutions through relatively new techniques. Such devices for appraisal as behavioral observation are as old as history itself; others have been developed through more recent efforts to appraise individuals and to evaluate their effectiveness in prescribed situations.

These various attempts have provided us with some understanding of why people act as they do, some awareness of the unconscious forces that contribute to personality strengths and weaknesses, and some avenues for speculation on the relationships existing between actual behavior and underlying motivations. Our knowledge, however, is far from sufficient. We still are not able to understand ourselves or others to abolish international wars, racial strife, or personal difficulties. We still assume that we can cope with the unique behavioral patterns exhibited by others much better than we really can. We still often forget that there may be bridges between what we might glean from the research and what we practice in our personal and organizational lives. And we realize that even if we were to operate at optimal levels, even if we were to apply certain research findings to our daily activities, we still must know much more to bring education to the point where it will allow every individual to function at his potential.

Overwhelming confusion rather than clarified direction may well be the reaction to the flurry of study and intense activity in this search for knowledge about man. There are yet no absolutes—even with our increased awareness of personality dynamics, sophisticated research designs, and statistical advances; with our understanding of the relationships among individual needs and environment; and with our recent attempts to relate teaching to defined objectives and measurable behavior. The research, of course, has netted something more than confusion and negative results; a few significant findings are occasionally accepted. For the most part, however, practice lags far behind the research. Potentially, we are able to know and act upon much more than we actually incorporate into our daily lives and institutions.

Why, then, this discrepancy between theory and practice? If youth symbolizes newness and readiness to adopt new practices—as youth throughout the ages has demonstrated—then the community college, higher education's newest offspring, might conceivably be the leader in instigating changes and developing practices. In spite of its youth, however, the community college is just as remiss as other educational institutions in accepting new patterns of behavior.

A SUMMARY

This monograph has attempted to answer some questions and to present material that will, it is hoped, help bridge the gaps between theory and practice. The criteria for selecting investigations to review were based upon two major themes: material considered sufficiently important as general information that it could eventually assist in the selection and placement of junior college faculty and/or material that could help people involved in the junior college movement to better know "what one is about."

To this end, Part I (Chapters I through III) was concerned with a review of personality theory and assessment, some general reports of the teacher's personality, classifications of faculty members on the bases of psychological and sociological theories, and the introduction of a typology for junior college teachers. Part II was divided into several categories where research was seen in terms of potential use. Chapters IV through VIII dealt with faculty selection, teacher training, innovative amenability, faculty roles, and teacher-student relationships. Although some investigations were concerned with elementary and secondary levels of education, they were included because they posed issues or reported findings relevant to the junior college. There were no overriding attempts to present all material, to draw together all findings, or to cover all possible implications. Some of these implications are fairly explicitly stated; others must be inferred. In all cases, the writer selected what was considered most applicable to the designated purposes of the monograph. The reader similarly must select what material pertains most to him and accordingly, draw his own conclusions.

An underlying theme running through this paper has been "to know what one is about." In choosing the material, certain questions were asked: Will this information help one to understand the personality of teachers? Does it help one to understand himself? Can it aid institutions in evaluating themselves?

If we are to evaluate our institutions, embark upon new patterns for conducting school organizations, and make new efforts to understand man, we must first know what we are about. Conflicts arise when one behaves in ways that are not consistent with one's basic personality. These same conflicts may give rise to all sorts of difficulties. In some cases there is little that one person or group can do to help others, or to contribute to the state of the world or the world's knowledge. We can, however, attempt to understand ourselves so that we do not unconsciously act out and project upon others some of the problems residing within us. If one is consistent with his own basic personality, if he functions honestly according to that inner self and, similarly, if the school knows itself and is able to work towards designated objectives, both individual and school have taken steps toward contributing to man's understanding of man.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Rather than deal with prescribed implications of the research reported in this monograph, certain recommendations will be made for specific groups of people. As suggested earlier, the references and the reports interpreted here represent only a small amount of the research on teachers and academic institutions. The reader who needs a more thorough survey is referred to the *Handbook of Research on Teaching* (59) and the *Encyclopedia of Educational Research* (75) or to some of the surveys noted in the text. It would be redundant to draw more inferences from the findings since, in the final analysis, the reader must establish his own and begin to implement them according to his needs. Instead of blanket suggestions, recommendations will be offered for specific groups: the administration of the college, the college faculty member, the professor of higher education, and the doctoral students in the university perparing for junior college work or for research on personality assessment, occupational roles, or higher education. The recommendations will be organized into special categories, although in all cases, there are no clear-cut divisions. What applies to the teacher may be equally relevant to the president or the university professor.

The College President and/or Administrative Staff

1. The first suggestion is basic to all others and, in this sense, it encompasses all facets of the community college. The establishment of defined institutional goals must be a joint effort of community, college administration, faculty, students, and even outside higher educational and industrial organizations. It requires a concentration upon the goals of society, the schools and individuals functioning within that society; the designation of specific objectives leading to the more general goals; and the establishment of methods for assessing existent conditions and then evaluating new findings against previous appraisals.

Most college catalogs present the school's general goals and objectives. It is suggested, however, that the combined efforts of many people working under administrative leadership will lead to a more valid specification of goals and, subsequently, to a greater awareness of "what the schools are about." This implies, of course, that the philosophy of the school can be explicitly stated and that the goals are exact enough to be hierarchically classified—from general to specific, from all-important to important only from certain viewpoints or in particular situations.

Community colleges must look at themselves objectively in terms of structure, finances, organization, and people. If a school, for example, is primarily geared to transfer students who will go on to the four-year college or university, it is quite different from the school dedicated to the vocational-technical student who terminates his formal education at the junior college. Most schools, of course, lie between these two and attempt to educate all their students in whatever way they can. However, if a school is slanted toward one end and if it can define its goals, it then can build programs and select teachers whose arms do not have to be twisted to adopt those goals. If teachers readily accept the major general objectives of the institution, and if the goals are consistent with the teachers' personality patterns, they should be in a better position to instruct students than those teachers who attempt to accept the institutional goals without awareness of their own feelings. This kind of acceptance remains only on the surface. Institutional goals to which certain teachers are antagonistic present greater sources of conflict than goals consistent with the teachers' beliefs and with their personality characteristics and attitudes. This is an important matter for faculty selection, goal orientation, the classification of institutions, and for the people who select teachers to instruct in the various schools. Faculty must be told in advance *exactly* where their responsibilities lie.

2. The administrator in charge of hiring other administrative personnel should himself know people and understand the various roles and functions intrinsic to the education profession. He must be able to hire, for example, deans of instruction who will in turn provide leadership in a manner consistent with institutional goals. In cases where administrators and faculty are employed through vast bureaucratic systems, the opportunity to exercise option may be tenuous. It is important, however, that "good" people be selected to man our educational organizations and that the highest officials in the junior college have opportunities to act in employment situations.

3. A liaison between administration and some public relations office must exist so that community and outside sources related to the college are distinctly aware of precise institutional goals. Perhaps a journalism teacher or a dean of personnel may carry out these functions, but in every case there must be communication between administrators and the community.

4. In combination with the dean of instruction and with the goal-planning board of the college, the administrator should focus on a teaching-learning paradigm (34). This suggests that unless demonstrable learning has occurred, teaching has not taken place. Since the primary purpose of education is to cause learning and the primary purpose of the community college is to teach, there must be a direct relationship between teaching and learning. The process of establishing this relationship lies largely with the college president.

Deans of Instruction, Counseling Psychologists, Curriculum Designers, and/or Personnel Managers

1. One responsibility held in common by most deans of instruc-

tion is the selection of faculty members. The research suggests that different kinds of personalities are suited to play different roles within the overall framework of teaching. It seems desirable, then, that deans of instruction select teachers who fit special roles—for example, test specialists, lecturers—rather than employ people with ability in a particular subject matter, with a certain number of course credits in English or with a certificate permitting instruction in a specific area on the basis of previous academic records. Instead of choosing a specialist in English, for example, the dean might do better to select teachers on the basis of their ability to lecture, to build tests, or to do public relations work. If institutions are very large and if multifarious activities are involved, it is possible for each specialist to assume a singular role. For smaller schools, individuals might need to engage in more than one function; but in all cases, they would have fewer activities than do most teachers today.

This appears to be a particularly worthwhile approach since teachers have, indeed, been found to differ in their interests, their abilities, their motivations, and their personal approaches. Some are effective in demonstration teaching or evaluating products and less effective in drill and follow-ups; others work better with individuals or in small groups; while still others depend primarily upon presenting lectures, outside reading assignments, and a variety of instructional media to their students.

Today's emphasis upon specialization has something to say for most occupational groups, but very little attention has been devoted to the various teaching roles. There has been little research in this area and still less implementation of research that *has* been reported. Still, emphasis should be placed upon the teacher as person—on his interests and orientations. Hall and Vincent noted that if

> . . . the teachers who receive satisfaction from teaching are the most effective, then the assignment process itself must guarantee the teacher certain personal satisfaction on the job. This demands a tremendous amount of information about the teacher and about the kinds of jobs and situations in which (he) finds satisfaction. *If it is true that a teacher who is growing professionally is an effective teacher, then this process must provide for (him) new and challenging opportunities for growth instead of deadening and boring monotony. If it is true that no individual possesses all the characteristics and behaviors necessary for any one learning situation, but that several teachers collectively may possess them, then the assignment pattern may involve several teachers for some learning situations and groups of children, instead of one teacher for one group of children.*
>
> *The answers to the issues raised here are not evident now, and very little research is now going on which is likely to throw much light on them. The present confusion—almost frustration*

> *—in attempting to define effective teaching and identify effective teachers may stem from the fact that what is known about the differences among teachers has not been applied to the teaching process and, specifically, to the assignment of teachers* (75:1,377).

2. The dean of instruction is probably the individual who must define the institutional objectives to prospective teachers and see, on the basis of material available to him, whether these appear congruent with the teacher's own orientation. Similarly, he should explain to the prospective instructor just what his duties will be, what is expected of him—both as teacher and as community member—and help him decide whether the institution is truly consistent with his personality. This, of course, assumes that the teacher knows himself.

3. Although teaching is one of the most humane of all professions, it often ignores the understanding of humans functioning in its groups. Deans of instruction, counseling psychologists, and those responsible for dealing with community college faculty might well take the lead in suggesting that teachers take courses in human relations so that they become sensitized to the own needs and to the needs of others. "Sensitivity training" workshops, group interactions, and even individual therapeutic situations, might well improve the quality of teaching by helping the instructor relate better to himself.

Those concerned with increasing the effectiveness of teachers must consider modification of the college curriculum to include experiences that will aid the potential teacher in his growth and psychological development. The application of group counseling might be appropriate for these purposes and is worthy of further investigation. Innovations such as human relations laboratories—including ample opportunity for expression of thought and feeling in group discussion—might be established as part of the regular curriculum. All approaches and innovations should be evaluated in terms of the degree to which they enhance or decrease the potential for individual growth. Such an emphasis might produce teachers who are more self-actualizing and hence more effective people (39).

4. Deans of instruction should be given information about prospective teachers beyond the academic and normative data supplied in conventional applications. This does not mean at all that he should test candidates himself, or that we have direct access to personality and interest inventories. In fact, he should not. It does mean, however, that he be given reports from independent agencies (personnel bureaus, placement offices) that provide valid but nonclinical appraisals of prospective faculty members. In the absence of personality data, interest patterns determined from inventories and previous vocational/nonvocational participation may provide important information.

This writer definitely feels that there are certain types of people who should be *selected out of teaching*. The authoritarian person appears to be especially amiss in those situations where youth is openly fighting "the establishment"—not merely for the sake of argument, but in its various attempts to establish its own identity. If junior college faculties include dogmatic, inflexible individuals (as many schools at all levels do), other arrangements might be made for them. They could be kept out of the classrooms and instead, be assigned other tasks with equal status. Their identity as "teacher" might be maintained, but their powers would be exercised in situations where they might not turn off or even damage the students.

5. The dean should be strong enough within himself that he can allow others to express themselves and can encourage his faculty to explore methods which are most suitable to their own orientations. This again assumes a kind of objectivity, self-knowledge, and honesty on the part of both dean and faculty. Its importance, however, cannot be emphasized enough; people need to know themselves if they are to be happy and effective in their work, and to appreciate others for maintaining their own individual approaches.

The Faculty

1. College presidents and deans are not the only community college personnel who must realize that people differ in their needs and in their ways of meeting those needs. The faculty, too, must know that people vary and that understanding of each person's uniqueness can add to rather than detract from a teacher's tasks. Because one colleague behaves in a particular manner does not mean that another teacher must act the same. Because students typically (or "should") act in such and such a manner does not necessarily mean that others will follow. The concept of individual differences carries with it many positive implications; they should be cherished—or, at least, respected.

2. Each faculty member should know himself, be able to say openly and honestly, "I would rather lecture to large groups than work with single students on a one-to-one basis," or "I want to develop curriculums, but I don't want to deal directly with students." These decisions should be made not because they are expedient, but because they are congruent with the personality pattern of the teacher.

3. Team teaching may be a way of encouraging both new and experienced teachers to develop their own personalities, fulfill their own needs, and relate best to their charges. Teaching methods must reflect the need structure of those who promote them. The teacher who stresses the lecture method may do so because he is most familiar with this method although in an age where several alternatives are available, he need not stick to a singular approach but may be free to choose the method that best fits his own needs. However, there are other interacting variables that might prevent a clear validation of this. For example, the effectiveness with which a teacher can function as an authority figure may depend on his previous

training, on his own needs, and on his environmental situation. If authoritarianism is frowned upon in his institution, he may in turn develop a different approach that may or may not be consistent with his basic needs. A teacher developing an individual style patterned on his needs, social backgrounds, and certain philosophical traditions, may feel a need to change the approach because of school and community conditions and the broad goals of the educational organization.

4. The beginning teacher also needs to know as much as possible about college education and his own junior college. Further, it is important that a certain emotional attitude toward learning be developed because, sooner or later, the novitiate must identify with education and the teaching process, just as he formerly identified with a particular field of specialization (28).

5. In spite of much criticism, it is not suggested that college teaching is altogether "bad," but that it certainly can and should be better. There is no single prescription to improve all college teaching, but there are certain guidelines that might be followed—for example, mastery of specialty is not enough and improvement does not occur without a desire for change and a realization of its possibility. The "average" teacher in the community college need not be discouraged, but anxious to look at himself objectively in relation to his peers and students and then to set about trying to improve the lot.

People in Departments of Higher Education, Research Personnel, and Doctoral Students

1. An important function of the university professor is to prepare people for junior college teaching. Proper preparation, however, implies a number of sequences and a variety of approaches. Information must be given to prospective students about the types of schools which they might enter; professors may help the community college personnel director hire his faculty on the basis of certain selection procedures; awareness of the unique problems of the community college may be emphasized. Perhaps two of the most important functions of the professor are to adopt an inquiring mind and to encourage his candidates to evaluate both organization and self.

2. The higher education instructor also must be aware of individual differences and not force students into teaching roles that appear inconsistent with their basic personalities or roles that the student teachers do not want. 'What is good for the goose' . . . and this need must be enforced.

3. Research on both teacher personality and teacher effectiveness has a long history. However, much of the research has been conducted in "theoretical vacuums" (62) where hypotheses are often based on oversimplifications and inadequate methodologies leading to conclusions neither psychologically nor sociologically valid. Theo-

retical concepts—learning theories, personality dynamics, advanced techniques of measurement—need to be considered before investigations are launched. Pre- and post-test procedures may also be installed with experimental and control groups both included so that objective evaluation of change (or no change) in procedural effects can be measured. Generally, teaching methods have not been designed systematically in terms of what is known about the learning process. Instead they have been products of transient thinking. The conditions that today most commonly generate teaching methods are unlikely to produce teaching patterns any more effective than those of the past. A consequence is that research on teaching bears little resemblance to scientific research which systematically builds up knowledge of a particular phenomenon. Further research on teaching procedures, then, must involve systematic designs where sets of identifiable conditions relating to learning are specified.

A second step in the revision of teaching methods includes the design of teacher behavior. Sanford pointed out that

> . . . one of the main barriers to reform in the colleges is a lack of a scientific basis for educational practice. The profession of college teaching is constantly in the awkward position of having promised more than it can deliver. The public is told that the college experience will "liberate the mind," "build the capacity to make value judgments," "inculcate the attitudes and values of democracy," but little evidence is offered on the degree to which these changes are accomplished. There are rival claims for different policies and programs, but the public, and indeed the faculties themselves, have little basis for a reasonable choice among them. The reason, of course, is the lack of knowledge about what kinds of educational policies and practices have what effects with what kinds of students. More fundamental than this is the lack of a generally accepted theory of individual human development in accordance with which colleges may state hypotheses pertaining to the relations of ends and means.

Education may be compared with psychotherapy in terms of being an applied art seeking to change individuals, although results of psychotherapy may often be disappointing. But,

> . . . because there is a general rationale of the whole proceeding, failures may often be understood and made the basis for improvement in practice. Experimentation and communication with colleagues, are integral with practice, and hence there is being developed a body of knowledge that will enable psychotherapy increasingly to achieve—even as it clarifies—its objectives.
>
> One might hope that the profession of college teaching will develop in the same way. Colleges are in a position to bring about, and sometimes they do bring about, by means that are

> strictly educational, changes as profound as those commonly wrought by psychotherapy.
>
> . . . the present argument that the profession of teaching may profit in some ways from the example of psychotherapy should not suggest that the college environment ought to be conceived as a therapeutic community or that the individual teacher ought to learn the techniques of the psychotherapist. When I speak of profound changes of a desirable sort being brought about by education, I have in mind such means as the curriculum, teaching in the classroom, the social organization, and intellectual climate of the college.
>
> . . . the basis for the profession of teaching must include systematic knowledge of what the entering student is like, particularly knowledge of his potential for learning and of his resistances to it, and knowledge of ways in which desired changes may be brought about. The instrument of change is not alone the individual teacher, but the whole educational program, and the whole college environment. How can the individual teacher, with a primary interest in his special academic subject, help to plan and then to assume a role within an overall program designed to achieve specified objectives? This is certainly one of the major dilemmas of higher education. The teacher, for the sake of his own humanity and—we have good reason to believe—for the sake of the goals of liberal education, must be free to advocate a point of view, to promote special interests, to win disciples.
>
> . . . teachers must take the major responsibility for planning so that freedom is allowed for, that in making and carrying out a plan they must have the professional identity of teachers of students rather than that of members of academic disciplines, and that social science may here be of considerable help. When the needed reform is carried out, the profession of college teaching will gain the amount of recognition that is required if the college is to have a real impact on its students and on society (137:21-24).

4. Eight points must be noted if research devoted to contrasting methods of teaching will lead to valid generalizations, whether they are observed in many institutions or within the same institution.

1. Objectives of the course
2. A content of subject matter
3. Methods and materials of instruction and evaluation
4. Personality and background of the teacher
5. Personality and background of the student
6. Physical characteristics of the classroom
7. Educational setting and institutional pressure
8. Class size. (42)

5. Perhaps one of the most fruitful approaches to establishing useful research designs is to go away from the educational literature. Psychology, sociology, and economics have all played a major part in educational research. Industrial personnel procedures might be valuable ways of asking how best to select and to keep faculty members. Subordinates, for example, (even students) might appraise a teacher and their pooled findings might be of interest.

6. There is a plethora of demographic data about teachers, but a paucity of research that follows the findings over a period of time. A plea is made for more longitudinal studies based upon replicable designs. In view of our complex systems of higher education, in view of time demands upon most people, and in view of the various stimuli that present themselves for attraction and/or detraction, it is difficult to think that one teacher and one student may exercise significant effects upon each other. The concepts of transference and counter-transference do exist in education, however, and it is possible to think that development of the student—a generally recognized goal of education—may work concomitantly with development in the individual personality structure. If we think of people as undergoing continual change and, hopefully, development, the idea of teacher-growth paralleling student-growth may not seem as unattainable or as "far out" as a superficial scrutiny would indicate.

It is, of course, impossible to isolate and measure every parameter that exists in the everyday functioning of a student or a teacher. However, given a set environment seen from a global rather than a specific viewpoint and a set situation for the teacher and for the student, it is possible to measure attitude, personality, complexes, and areas of emotional and cognitive functioning prior to the interactional situations where people encounter each other. It is possible to view a situation, to measure the existing personality characteristics, and then to see whether, indeed, there are changes in those characteristics after the exposure to a teacher, a class, a system. Only by previous knowledge of the individuals comprising educational systems—students, faculty, and administration—can we really know whether development has occurred, what the nature of that development is, whether it is meaningful or not, and what our future directions may be.

Research regarding teacher-student interactions in prescribed environments appears to be a particularly fruitful area for research. Most teacher-student investigations have dealt with certain prescribed characteristics that evaluate certain measures of pupil gain as they relate to teacher personality. Perhaps a more valuable approach would be one that would increase our understanding of human behavior and establish prescribed measures of human learning achievement by discovering whether or not teachers are most successful when they deal with students of congruent or dissimilar personality structures. We might ask such simple questions as these: Do teachers who tend to be extraverted in thinking and behavioral manifestations relate better to students who are similarly extraverted? In terms of taxonomic scheme of cognitive classification, is the individual who functions at the level of synthesis better able to learn from the teacher who functions at the same level or does synthesis depend upon analysis or other measures on this hierarchy?

Again, dealing now with the more global aspects of personality strength, we might ask another question: Is the individual high in ego-strength better able to learn from a teacher who is spontaneous, impulsive, and unstructured because his own abilities to delay gratification allow him to discard the spontaneous behavior that might bother the student who has yet to make peace with these personality dimensions? This line of questioning could be used to describe almost any variable or to apply theory to answer more fundamental questions. Do teachers and students who manifest certain similar personality characteristics tend to relate better than teachers and students who have dissimilar characteristics? Does similarity stimulate or retard effective teaching, i.e., the illustration of learning?

In spite of the fact that we know little about student characteristics, we know today even less about instructor characteristics. We do know that most faculty members who are attentive to individual students are more likely to be effective teachers than those who are less attentive to the students.

> We have only rudimentary knowledge of other factors relevant to the personalization of instruction, but we are particularly lacking in studies of faculty characteristics. Many of the measures used to test student characteristics are inappropriate for faculty or would be difficult to administer because of lack of faculty acceptance. Thus, I suspect we may need to turn to interview techniques of assessing the needs and satisfactions relevant to personalization.

And again,

> As faculty members it is easier for us to accept the possibility that students may have personal barriers to learning than to recognize that we as teachers often defend against real change in ourselves. If we accept Roger Heyns' definition of college as a community of learners, every teacher-student interaction carries potential for learning of both teacher and student. One of the barriers to student learning is that many professors see themselves as handing down learning from a celestial throne. We know very little about professors' views of themselves and their roles and the effect of different role concepts upon personalization of instruction (107:31).

The recent research on college professors needs to be followed with studies of such variables as:

1) the ability to see the professor's subject matter from the perspective of the student
2) his flexibility and ways of conceptualizing the subject matter
3) commitment to his field
4) nurturance
5) willingness to listen and learn from his students.

Even large universities and large classes may provide opportunities for individuality. Perhaps it would be feasible in larger classes to let some students gain information from library learning rather than from class attendance. Other students might be encouraged to do laboratory work and still others to gain experiences in field settings. Small group discussions, computer conferences, and other innovative approaches might be employed. McKeachie suggested that at present we "do not know much about which students best achieve which goals with which experiences (107), but the mere presence of several alternatives may result in educational gains. Students have opinions about what they can best learn and, although these opinions are not always valid, giving them the opportunity to determine their own conditions of learning, to suffer the consequences of bad choices, and to learn from these consequences may be the most important way in which education can be personalized. Information of the interaction of student characteristics and teacher characteristics as it relates and affects learning may suggest that it is best to feed all the data into a computer and assign students to classes with those teachers who would best fit their needs. However, this seems to be unlikely and perhaps an "undesirable consequence." Perhaps we would do better to teach a student to learn from a variety of teachers rather than restrict him to teachers to whom he can adjust most easily. Similarly, McKeachie goes on to say, teachers might be trained to identify and teach effectively those students who are not normally "turned on" by their style of learning. In this way, a sensitive teacher can respond to feedback from students and can modify his tactics from week to week and day to day as he observes their effects.

> Teaching should be a two-way process in which both students and teachers learn from one another; as long as teaching conditions facilitate a two-way interaction, we can place substantial reliance on the good sense of teachers and students (107:31).

This, of course, implies a certain amount of flexibility and adaptability in the teacher. If our educational systems are not constructed so that teachers are best organized along certain dimensions or roles or certain specific needs, it seems that the adaptability potential of the teacher is even more important—that is, whether he is flexible and creative enough to adjust his own personality and his own way of teaching to his various students and to institutional demands.

Personality assessment is only one facet of the appraisal picture. Evaluation is a multidimensional concept that embraces both tangible and intangible factors. Organizational evaluation does not have the history behind it that the search for understanding of man has, and perhaps it need not involve the same amount of time. Still, our search must continue to help educational institutions and each individual functioning in them to know well "what one is about."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Ackerman, Walter I. "Teacher Competence and Pupil Change." *Harvard Educational Review* 24: 273-289; Fall 1954.
2. Adelson, Joseph. "The Teacher as a Model." *The American College.* (Edited by Nevitt Sanford.) New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1962.
3. Adler, A. *The Practice and Theory of Individual Psychology.* New York: Harcourt, 1927.
4. Adorno, T. W., et al. *The Authoritarian Personality.* New York: Harper Bros., 1950.
5. Allen, Lucile A., and Sutherland, Robert L. *Role Conflicts and Congruences Experienced by New Faculty Members as They Enter the Culture of a College Community.* Austin: University of Texas, Hogg Foundation for Mental Health, 1963.
6. Allport, G.W. *Pattern and Growth in Personality.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1961.
7. ———. *Personality; A Psychological Interpretation.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1937.
8. ———. *The Person in Psychology.* Boston: Beacon Press, 1968.
9. Amidon, Edmund J., and Flanders, Ned A. *The Role of the Teacher in the Classroom: A Manual for Understanding and Improving Teachers' Classroom Behavior.* Minneapolis, Minn.: Paul S. Amidon and Associates, 1963.
10. Anderson, H.H.; Brewer, J. E.; and Reed, Mary F. "Studies of Teachers' Classroom Personalities. II. Follow-Up Studies of the Effects of Dominative and Integrative Contacts on Children's Behavior." *Applied Psychology Monograph.* No. 2. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1946.
11. Angyal, Andras. "The Holistic Approach in Psychiatry." *American Journal of Psychiatry* 105: 178-182; September 1948.
12. Bales, Robert F. *Interaction Process Analysis.* Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc., 1950.
13. Barr, A.S. "The Measurement and Prediction of Teaching Efficiency: A Summary of Investigations." *Journal of Experimental Education* 16: 203-283; June 1948.
14. Beardslee, D.C., and O'Dowd, D.D. "College Student Images of Key Occupations." Address given at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, Cincinnati, Ohio, September 1959.
15. Bellack, Arno A., et al. *The Language of the Classroom: Meanings Communicated in High School Teaching.* Cooperative Research Project No. 1497. New York: Institute of Psychological Research, Columbia University, 1963.
16. Blocker, Clyde E. "Are Our Faculties Competent?" *Junior College Journal 36:* 12-17; December/January 1965-66.
17. Borg, W. R., and Brite, Luna R. "Teacher's Perceptions of Team

Teaching." *California Journal of Educational Research* 18: 71-81; March 1967.

18. Borow, Henry. "Frontiers of Personnel Research in Education—Part I: Modern Perspectives in Personnel Research." *Personal Services in Education.* (Edited by Nelson R. Henry.) Fifty-Eighth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1959.
19. Bousfield, W. A. "Students' Ratings of Qualities Considered Desirable in College Professors." *School and Society* 51: 253-256; February 24, 1940.
20. Bowers, Norman D., and Soar, Robert S. *Studies of Human Relations in the Teaching-Learning Process. V Final Report: Evaluation of Laboratory Human Relations Training for Classroom Teachers.* Cooperative Research Project No. 469. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1961.
21. Bowman, Claude. *The College Professor in America.* Doctor's Thesis. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1938.
22. Brawer, Florence B. *The Concept of Ego Strength and Its Measurement Through a Word Association Technique.* Doctor's Thesis. Los Angeles: University of California, 1967. Abstract: *Dissertation Abstracts* 28: 1699-A.
23. ———. *The Introversive-Extratensive Dimensions of the Rorschach and Their Relationships to Jungian Typology.* Master's Thesis. Los Angeles: University of California, 1962.
24. Brawer, Florence B., and Cohen, Arthur M. "Global and Sign Approaches to Rorschach Assessment of Beginning Teachers." *Journal of Projective Techniques and Personality Assessment* 30: 536-542; December 1966.
25. Brawer, Florence B. and Spiegelman, J. Marvin. "Rorschach and Jung: A Study of Introversion-Extraversion." *Journal of Analytical Psychology* 9: 137-149; January 1964.
26. Bright, R. Lewis. "Research in Educational Technology." EDUCOM 2: 6-8; December 1967.
27. Budd, William C., and Blakely, Lynda S. "Response Bias on the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory." *Journal of Educational Research* 51: 707-709; May 1958.
28. Buxton, Claude E. *College Teaching; A Psychologist's View.* New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1956.
29. Calvin, Allen D.; Hoffman, Frederic K.; and Harden, Edgar L. "The Effect of Intelligence and Social Atmosphere on Group Problem Solving Behavior." *Journal of Social Psychology* 45: 61-74; February 1957.
30. Caplow, Theodore, and McGee, Reese. *The Academic Marketplace.* New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1958.
31. Cattell, Raymond B. "Confirmation and Clarification of Primary Personality Factors." *Psychometrica* 12: 197-220; September 1947.

32. Christopher, John L. *Certain Aspects of the Teachers Role in Wyoming Junior Colleges With Implications for Program Planning and Improvement.* Doctor's Thesis. Laramie: University of Wyoming, Division of Graduate Study, College of Education, 1966.
33. Clinton, R. J. "Qualities College Students Desire in College Instructors." *School and Society* 32: 702; November 22, 1930.
34. Cohen, Arthur M. "Defining Instructional Objectives." *Systems Approaches to Curriculum and Instruction in the Open-Door College.* (Edited by B. Lamar Johnson.) Junior College Leadership Program Occasional Report No. 9. Los Angeles: University of California, School of Education, 1967.
35. ———. "Teacher Preparation: Rationale and Practice." *Junior College Journal* 37: 21-25; May 1967.
36. ———. "Teach Toward Measurable Objectives." *Improving College and University Teaching* 14: 246-248; Autumn 1966.
37. Cohen, Arthur M., and Brawer, Florence B. "Adaptive Potential and First Year Teaching Success." *Journal of Teacher Education* 18: 179-185; Summer 1967.
38. ———. *Focus on Learning: Preparing Teachers for the Two-Year College.* Junior College Leadership Program Occasional Report No. 11. Los Angeles: University of California, School of Education, March 1968.
39. Dandes, Herbert M. "Psychological Health and Teaching Effectiveness." *Journal of Teacher Education* 17: 301-306; Fall 1966.
40. Dixon, Robert W., and Morse, William C. "The Prediction of Teaching Performance: Empathic Potential." *Journal of Teacher Education* 12: 322-329; September 1961.
41. Domas, S. J., and Tiedeman, D. V. "Teacher Competence: An Annotated Bibliography." *Journal of Experimental Education* 19: 101-218; December 1950.
42. Dressel, P. *Research in General Education Instruction.* Washington, D. C.: Association for Higher Education, a department of the National Education Association, 1955.
43. Dutton, Wilbur H. "Attitude Change of Elementary School Student Teachers and Anxiety." *Journal of Educational Research* 55: 380-382; 1962.
44. Eckert, R. E., and Stecklien, J. E. *An Exploratory Study of Factors Influencing the Choice of College Teaching as a Career.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1958.
45. Eiduson, Bernice T. *Scientists—Their Psychological World* New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1962.
46. Elton, Charles F., and Rose, Harriett A. "Significance of Personality in the Vocational Choice of College Women." *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 14: 293-298; July 1967.
47. Emden, A. B. *Biographical Register of the University of Oxford*

to A.D. 1500 Volume 1. New York: Oxford University Press, Inc., 1957.

48. Erikson, E. H. *Childhood and Society* New York: Norton, 1950.
49. Fiedler, Fred E. "The Concept of an Ideal Therapeutic Relationship." *Journal of Consulting Psychology* 14: 239-245; August 1950.
50. Filson, T. N. *Factors Influencing the Level of Dependence in the Classroom.* Doctor's Thesis. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1957.
51. Fishburn, C. E. *Teacher Role Perception in the Secondary Schools of One Community.* Abstract: *Dissertation Abstracts* 15: 1798-1799; 1955.
52. Flanders, Ned A. *Teacher Influence, Pupil Attitudes, and Achievement.* Cooperative Research Project No. 397. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1960.
53. Flanders, Ned A., and Amidon, Edmund J. "Two Approaches to the Teaching Process." *NEA Journal* 51: 43-45; May 1962.
54. Frenkel-Brunswick, Else, and Sanford, R. Nevitt. "Some Personality Factors in Anti-Semitism." *Journal of Psychology* 20: 271-291; October 1945.
55. Friedman, Norman L. "Career Stages and Organizational Role Decisions of Teachers in Two Public Junior Colleges." *Sociology of Education* 40: 231-245; Summer 1967.
56. ———. *The Public Junior College Teacher in Unified Public School System Junior Colleges: A Study in the Sociology of Educational Work.* Doctor's Thesis. Columbia: University of Missouri, 1965.
57. ———. "The Subject Matterist Orientation Toward Field of Academic Orientation." *The American Sociologist* 2: 12-15; February 1967.
58. Fromm, E. *Escape From Freedom.* New York: Rinehart, 1941.
59. Gage, N. L., editor. *Handbook of Research on Teaching.* Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1963.
60. Galton, F. *Inquiries Into Human Faculty.* New York: Macmillan & Co., 1883.
61. Garrison, Roger H. *Junior College Faculty: Issues and Problems; A Preliminary National Appraisal.* Washington, D. C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967.
62. Getzels, J. W., and Jackson, P. W. "The Teacher's Personality and Characteristics." *Handbook of Research on Teaching.* (Edited by N. L. Gage.) Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1963.
63. Gleazer, Edmund J., Jr. "Concerns and Cautions for Community Colleges." *Junior College Journal* 38: 18-21; March 1968.
64. Goldstein, K. *Human Nature in the Light of Psychopathology.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1940.
65. Gordon, C. Wayne; Adler, Leta M.; and McNeil, John D. *Dimensions of Teacher Leadership in Classroom Social Systems.*

Cooperative Research Project No. 1084. Los Angeles: University of California, 1963.

66. Guba, E. G., and Getzels, J. W. "Personality and Teacher Effectiveness: A Problem in Theoretical Research." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 46: 330-344; 1955.

67. Guilford, J. P. *Psychometric Methods*. Second edition. New York: McGraw, 1954.

68. Gusfield, Joseph, and Riesman, David. "Faculty Culture and Academic Careers." *The College Student and His Culture: An Analysis*. (Edited by K. Yamamoto.) Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968.

69. Gustad, J. W. *Career Decisions of College Teachers*. Atlanta: Southern Regional Service Board, 1960.

70. ———. *Faculty Preparation and Orientation*. Winchester, Mass.: New England Board of Higher Education, 1960.

71. ———. "The Compleat Academician." *Teachers College Record* 65: 112-122; November 1963.

72. Hall, R. K.; Hans, N.; and Lauwerys, J. A., editors. *The Yearbook of Education, 1953*. Yonkers, N. Y.: World Book Co., 1953.

73. Hall, Roy M., and Vincent, Antonio M. "Staff—Selection and Appointment." *Encyclopedia of Educational Research*. (Edited by Chester W. Harris.) New York: Macmillan Co., 1960.

74. Halpin, A. W. "A Paradigm for Research on Administrative Behavior." *Administrative Behavior in Education*. (Edited by Roald F. Campbell and Russell T. Gregg.) New York: Harper & Row, 1957.

75. Harris, Chester W., editor. *Encyclopedia of Education Research*. New York: Macmillan Company, 1960.

76. Hartmann, H. "Comments on the Psychoanalytic Theory of the Ego." *The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*. Volume 5. (Edited by Anna Freud and others.) New York: International Universities Press, 1950.

77. Havighurst, Robert J., and Newgarten, Bernice L. *Society and Education*. Third edition. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1967.

78. Heath, R. *The Reasonable Adventurer*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1964.

79. Heil, L. M. *Characteristics of Teacher Behavior and Competency Related to Achievement of Different Kinds of Children in Several Grades*. New York: Brooklyn College, 1960.

80. Heine, R. W. *A Comparison of Patients' Reports on Psychotherapeutic Experience with Psychoanalytic, Non-Directive, and Adlerian Therapists*. Doctor's Thesis. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1950.

81. Heist, Paul. "Creative Students: College Transients." *Education for Creativity*. (Edited by Paul Heist.) Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1967.

82. ———. "Professions and the Student." *College Student and his Culture: An Analysis.* (Edited by K. Yamamoto.) Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1968.

83. Hendrix, Vernon L. "Relationships Between Personnel Policies and Faculty Live-Record Data in Public Junior Colleges." *California Journal of Educational Research* 15: 150-160; May 1964.

84. ———. "Relationships Between Personnel Policies and Faculty Personality Characteristics in Public Junior Colleges." *California Journal of Educational Research* 15: 34-43; January 1964.

85. Hewett, Waterman T. *Cornell University: A History.* Volume 4. Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Publication Society, 1905.

86. Hirsee, L. E., and Campbell, R. J. *Psychiatric Dictionary.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1960.

87. Hunter, Elwood C. "Attitudes and Professional Relationships of Teachers: A Study of Teacher Morale." *Journal of Experimental Education* 23: 345-352; June 1955.

88. Isaacson, Robert L.; McKeachie, Wilbert J.; and Milholland, John E. "Correlation of Teacher Personality Variables and Student Ratings." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 54: 110-117; April 1963.

89. Jacob, P. E. *Changing Values in College.* New York: Harper Bros., 1957.

90. Jung, Carl G. *Psychological Types.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, Ltd., 1923.

91. ———. "Two Essays on Analytical Psychology." *Collected Works.* Volume 7. New York: Pantheon Press, 1953.

92. Kelly, G. A. *The Psychology of Personal Constructs.* New York: Norton, 1955.

93. ———. *A Theory of Personality.* New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1963.

94. Kelly, Robert L. "Great Teachers." *Bulletin of the Association of American Colleges* 15: 49-67; March 1929.

95. Kinney, L. B. *Measure of a Good Teacher.* San Francisco: California Teachers Association, 1952.

96. Knapp, Robert H. "Changing Functions of the College Professor." *The American College: A Psychological and Social Interpretation of Higher Learning.* (Edited by N. Sanford.) New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 162.

97. Koffka, K. *Principles of Gestalt Psychology.* New York: Harcourt, 1935.

98. Kris, E. *Psychoanalytic Explorations in Art.* New York: International Universities Press, 1952.

99. Leavitt, Jerome E. "Personnel Data and Prediction of Success of Student Teachers." *Journal of Teacher Education* 4: 194-197; September 1953.

100. Levinson, Daniel J. "Role, Personality, and Social Structure in the Organizational Setting." *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 58: 170-180; March 1959.

101. MacLean, Malcolm S.; Gowan, M. Seagoe; and Gowan, John C. "A Teacher Selection and Counseling Service." *Journal of Educational Research* 48: 669-677; May 1955.

102. MacKinnon, Donald W. "The Nature and Nurture of Creative Talent." *American Psychologist* 17: 484-495; July 1962.

103. MacKinnon, Donald W., and others. "An Assessment Study of Air Force Officers: I. Design of the Study and Description of the Variables." *USAF WADC Technical Report.* Part IX, No. 58-91, 1958.

104. Maslow, A. H. "Self-Actualizing People: A Study of Psychological Health." *Personality.* Symposium No. 1, 1950.

105. Maslow, A. H., and Zimmerman, W. "College Teaching Ability, Scholarly Activity and Personality." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 47: 185-189; 1956.

106. McGee, Henry M. "Measurement of Authoritarianism and Its Relation to Teachers' Classroom Behavior." *Genetic Psychology Monographs* 52: 89-146; August 1955.

107. McKeachie, W. J. "Research on Teaching at the College and University Level." *Handbook of Research on Teaching.* (Edited by N. L. Gage.) Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1963.

108. McKeachie, W. J., and others. "Student Affiliation Motives, Teacher Warmth, and Academic Achievement." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 4: 457-461; October 1966.

109. McKinley, J. C.; Hathaway, S. R.; and Meehl, P. E. "The K Scale." *Basic Readings on the MMPI in Psychology and Medicine.* (Edited by G. S. Welsh and W. G. Dahlstrom.) Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1956.

110. Medley, Donald M., and Mitzel, Harold E. "Measuring Classroom Behavior by Systematic Observation." *Handbook of Research on Teaching.* (Edited by N. L. Gage.) Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1963.

111. ———. "Some Behavioral Correlates of Teacher Effectiveness." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 50: 239-246; December 1959.

112. Medsker, Leland L. *The Junior College: Progress and Prospect.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1960.

113. Melby, Ernest O. "The Effect of Current Educational Programs on Personality Development." *American Journal of Psychiatry* 109: 856-857; May 1953.

114. Messick, Samuel. "Personality Structure." *Annual Review of Psychology* 12: 93-128; 1961.

115. Meursius, Johannes. *Illustris Academia Lugd-Batava.* Leyden, 1613. Available in the Royal Library, The Hague.

116. Moore, Clark H., and Cole, David. "The Relation of MMPI

Scores to Practice Teaching Ratings." *Journal of Educational Research* 50: 711-716; May 1957.

117. Morse, William C; Bloom, Richard; and Dunn, James. *A Study of School Classroom Behavior From Diverse Evaluative Frameworks: Developmental, Mental Health, Substantive Learning, and Group Process.* Cooperative Research Project No. 753. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, School of Education, 1961.
118. Morsh, J. E., and Wilder, Eleanor W. "Identifying the Effective Instructor: A Review of the Quantitative Studies, 1900-1952." *USAF Personnel Training Research Center Research Bulletin* No. AFPTRC-TR-54-44. 1954.
119. Murphy, G. *Personality: A Biosocial Approach to Origins and Structure.* New York: Harper, 1947.
120. Murray, H. A., and others. *Explorations in Personality.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1938.
121. Myers, I. B., and Briggs, K. C. *Myers-Briggs Type Indicator.* Princeton, N. J.: Educational Testing Service, 1962.
122. National Education Association. Research Division. "The Teacher Looks at Personnel Administration." *NEA Research Bulletin* 23: 93-147; December 1945.
123. Office of Strategic Services. Assessment Staff. *Assessment of Men.* New York: Rinehart, 1948.
124. Pace, C. Robert. "Implications of Differences in Campus Atmosphere." *Personality Factors on the College Campus.* (Edited by R. L. Sutherland and others.) Austin: The Hogg Foundation for Mental Health, 1962.
125. ———. *The Influence of Academic and Student Subcultures in College and University Environments.* Cooperative Research Project No. 1083. Los Angeles: University of California, 1964.
126. Palmer, Josephine S. *Role Concepts of Prospective Teachers of Young Children.* Doctor's Thesis. New York: Columbia University, 1954.
127. Pepper, James N. *Factors Involved in Recruitment and Retention of Teachers in Michigan.* Doctor's Thesis. Detroit: Wayne State University, 1954.
128. Reitz, Willard E.; Very, Phillip S.; and Guthrie, George M. "Experience, Expertness, and Ideal Teaching Relationships." *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 25: 1051-1060; Winter 1965.
129. Roe, Anne. "Early Determinants of Vocational Choice." *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 4: 212-217; Fall 1957.
130. ———. *The Psychology of Occupations.* New York: Wiley, 1956.
131. Rogers, C. R. *Client-Centered Therapy; Its Current Practice, Implications, and Theory.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1951.
132. Roueche, John E. *Salvage, Redirection, or Custody?* ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information Monograph No. 1.

Washington, D. C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1968.

133. Ryans, David G. *Characteristics of Teachers: Their Description, Comparison, and Appraisal.* Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1960.

134. ———. "Some Concomitants of Inventory-Estimated Emotional Maturity of Experienced Teachers." *California Journal of Educational Research* 11: 106-109, 144; May 1960.

135. Sanford, Nevitt, editor. *The American College: A Psychological and Social Interpretation of Higher Learning.* New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1962.

136. ———. "Higher Education as a Field of Study." *The American College: A Psychological and Social Interpretation of Higher Learning.* (Edited by Nevitt Sanford.) New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1962.

137. ———. "Implications of Personality Studies for Curriculum and Personnel Planning." *Personality Factors on the College Campus.* (Edited by R. L. Sutherland and others.) Austin: University of Texas, the Hogg Foundation, 1962.

138. ———*Self and Society.* New York: Atherton Press, 1966.

139. ———. *Where Colleges Fail.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1967.

140. Sheldon, M. Stephen; Coale, Jack M.; and Copple, Rockne. "Concurrent Validity of the 'Warm Teacher' Scales." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 50: 37-40; February 1959.

141. Smith, B. Othanel, and others. *A Study of the Logic of Teaching.* Cooperative Research Project No. 258. Urbana: University of Illinois, 1962.

142. Soper, D. W., and Combs, A. W. "The Helping Relationship as Seen by Teachers and Therapists." *Journal of Consulting Psychology* 26: 288; June 1962.

143. Sorenson, A. Gurth; Husek, T. R.; and Yu, Constance. "Divergent Concepts of Teacher Role: An Approach to the Measurement of Teacher Effectiveness." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 54: 287-294; December 1963.

144. Spaulding, Robert L. *Achievement, Creativity, and Self-Concept Correlates of Teacher-Pupil Transactions in Elementary Schools.* Urbana: University of Illinois, 1963.

145. Spearman, C. "General Intelligence Objectively Determined and Measured." *American Journal of Psychology* 15: 201-293; 1904.

146. Spiegelman, M. "The Rorschach Technique in Social Psychology." *Development in the Rorschach Technique,* Volume II. (Edited by B. Klopfer and others.) Yonkers-on-Hudson, New York: World Book Co., 1956.

147. Stern, G. G.; Stein, M. I.; and Bloom, B. S. *Methods in Personality Assessment.* Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1956.

148. Sullivan, H. S. *The Interpersonal Theory of Psychiatry.* New York: Norton, 1953.

149. Super, Donald Edwin. *The Psychology of Careers; An Introduction to Vocational Development.* First edition. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957.

150. Symonds, Percival. "Education and Psychotherapy." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 40: 1-32; January 1949.

151. ———. "Personality of the Teacher." *Journal of Educational Research* 40: 652-661; May 1947.

152. ———. "Teaching as a Function of the Teacher's Personality." *Journal of Teacher Education* 5: 79-83; March 1954.

153. Taba, Hilda, and others. *Thinking in Elementary School Children.* Cooperative Research Project No. 1574. San Francisco: San Francisco State College, 1964.

154. Thistlethwaite, Donald L. "Rival Hypotheses for Explaining the Effects of Different Learning Environments." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 53: 310-315; December 1962.

155. Thornton, J. W. *The Community Junior College.* Second edition. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966.

156. Tiffin, J.; Knight, F. B.; and Josey, C. C. *The Psychology of Normal People.* Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1940.

157. Torrance, E. Paul. "The Creative Personality and the Ideal Pupil." *Teachers College Record* 65: 220-226; December 1963.

158. Trabue, M. R. "Characteristics of College Instructors Desired by Liberal Arts College Presidents." *Bulletin of Association of American Colleges* 36: 374-379; October 1950.

159. Tuttle, Harold S. "Profile of Professors." *Educational Forum* 20: 313-318; March 1956.

160. Tyler, Ralph W. "New Dimensions in Curriculum Development." *Phi Delta Kappan* 48: 25-28; September 1966.

161. Very, Philip S., and Dye, Neal W. "Conceptualizations of the College Teacher." *Perceptual and Motor Skills* 22: 889-890; June 1966.

162. Volbehr, Friedrich, and Weyl, Richard. *Professoren und Dozenten der Christian-Albrechts-Universitat zu Kiel, 1655 bis 1915.* Schmidt and Klaunig, 1916.

163. Wallen, N. E., and Travers, R. M. W. "Analysis and Investigation of Teaching Methods." *Handbook of Research on Teaching.* (Edited by N. L. Gage.) Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963.

164. Weber, C. A. "Some Characteristics of College Teachers." *Journal of Educational Research* 46: 685-692; 1953.

165. Wilk, Roger E., and Edson, William H. *A Study of the Relationship Between Observed Classroom Behaviors of Elementary Student Teachers, Predictors of Those Behaviors, and Ratings by Supervisors.* Cooperative Research Project No. 473. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, College of Education, 1962.

166. ———. "Predictions and Performance: An Experimental Study of Student Teachers." *Journal of Teacher Education* 14: 308-317; September 1963.

167. Will, Richard Y. "The Education of the Teacher as a Person." *Journal of Teacher Education* 18: 471-475; Winter 1967.

168. Williams, Frank E. "Intellectual Creativity and the Teacher." *Journal of Creative Behavior* 1: 173-180; Spring 1967.

169. Yamamoto, Kaoru. "Evaluating Teacher Effectiveness: A Review of Research." *Journal of School Psychology* 2: 60-71; Winter 1963/64.

170. ———. "Interprofessional Attitudes Among School Personnel: A Preliminary Exploration." *Journal of School Psychology* 3: 28-35; Summer 1965.